DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 255 CE 001 808

AUTHOR	Burleson, Richard A.
TITLE	SWP versus PEP: A Comparison Between the Vermont E & D Special Work Project and the Public Employment Program in Vermont. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Vermont State Employment Service, Montpelier. Dept. of Employment Security.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-82-48-70-30-6-FR
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	81p.; For related documents, see CE 001 805-818
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; *Employment Programs; *Employment Qualifications; *Federal Programs; *Job Placement; Low Income Groups; Pilot Projects; *Public Service Occupations; Recruitment; Service Occupations; Unemployment; Wages; Welfare Recipients; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	Manpower Research; *Vermont

ABSTRACT

This report compares Vermont's experience with two federally funded programs aimed at reducing unemployment. The first was a Special Work Project (SWP) directed toward providing work experience rather than skill training for welfare recipients, and also for low-income families. A second approach was through the Public Employment Program (PEP). This latter program was created to subsidize jobs for the temporarily unemployed when the general U. S. economy could not absorb these people. Eligibility and wage subsidization for each program differed. The SWP program was oriented toward the working poor and those with multiple nonjob related personal problems. Participants in PEP were usually the recently unemployed. Each program could underwrite up to 90 percent of the client's salary. Subsidized wages paid for each PEP slot averaged $7,000 annually, while $4,000 was spent under SWP. (Also included are four appendixes, a list of 20 tables, and a seven-item bibliography.) (Author)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 094255

S W P VERSUS P E P:

A COMPARISON OF

THE VERMONT E & D SPECIAL WORK PROJECT

WITH

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IN VERMONT

Vermont Department of Employment Security

Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner

The Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on the Special Work Project for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor

CE001808

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

September 1973

ED 094255

SWP VERSUS PEP:

A COMPARISON BETWEEN

THE VERMONT E&D SPECIAL WORK PROJECT

AND

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IN VERMONT

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract No. 82-48-70-30. Since contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Contract No. 82-48-70-30 funded the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project on Special Work Projects for the Unemployed and Upgrading for the Working Poor. This Project was conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, Madelyn Davidson, Commissioner. The principal author of this monograph is Richard A. Burleson of the Department of Employment Security, State of Vermont.

September, 1973

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. DLMA 82-48-70-30- 6	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title And Subtitle SWP VERSUS PEP: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE VERMONT E&D SPECIAL WORK PROJECT AND THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM IN VERMONT			5. Report Date Sep. 73 6.
7. Author(s) Richard A. Burleson, Vermont Department of Employment Security			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Vermont Department of Employment Security Box 488, Green Mountain Drive Montpelier, Vermont 05602			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DL 82-48-70-30
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration Office of Research and Development 1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210			13. Type of Report & Period Covered 11/1/70 - Final: 6/30/73 14.

15. Supplementary Notes Prepared as part of the Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Pilot Project conducted by the Vermont Department of Employment Security.

16. Abstracts This report compares Vermont's experience with two federally funded programs aimed at reducing unemployment. The first was a Special Work Project (SWP) directed toward providing work experience rather than skill training for welfare recipients, and also for low-income families. A second approach was through the Public Employment Program (PEP). This latter program was created to subsidize jobs for the temporarily unemployed when the general U.S. economy could not absorb these people. Eligibility and wage subsidization for each program differed. The SWP program was oriented toward the working poor and those with multiple non-job related personal problems. Participants in PEP were usually the recently unemployed. Each program could underwrite up to 90% of the client's salary. Subsidized wages paid for each PEP slot average $7,000 annually, while $4,000 was spent under SWP.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Earnings
Economic conditions
Handicapped workers
Unemployment

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5A, 5I, 5K

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151. iv/v	UNCLASSIFIED	91
	20. Security Class (This Page)	22. Price
		$3.00

PREFACE

In mid-1970, as a consequence of welfare reform legislation then pending in the United States Congress, the Vermont Department of Employment Security was chosen to test and document experimentation in the manpower training aspects of the proposed legislation. The overall objective of the resulting Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting the Special Work Project (Public Service Employment) for the unemployed and Upgrading training for the working poor, as a means of helping to develop guidelines and other knowledge required to facilitate and make more effective national implementation and rapid expansion of manpower projects aimed at enhancing the employability of heads (and other members) of low-income families.

The project thus had two major components within the overall project:

- "Special Work Project" whereby unemployed persons, by performing work (at public and private nonprofit agencies in the public interest) can develop job skills which enable them to obtain nonsubsidized (private or public) employment,

- "Upgrading training" whereby low-income employed persons ("working poor") can develop new job skills for which they receive increased salary.

More specifically the project:

- developed various designs for operating the two manpower programs,

- tested operating practices to identify smooth running procedures,

- tested the feasibility and relative effectiveness of alternative operating procedures,

-identified problems and issues central to the establishment and running of these programs,

-prepared technical materials and other aids for use in the programs,

-monitored and evaluated outcomes of activities,

-determined requirements for administration, facilities, staff and financing of the programs,

-established guides for determining how these programs might fit into the overall mixture of manpower programs and services at the local level,

-developed the necessary guidelines and manuals for effectively replicating the programs elsewhere,

-researched and documented the effect of the program on E&D manpower clients and,

-produced monographs on salient aspects of project experience, relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

The project was initiated on July 1, 1970, and terminated on October 31, 1973. Operation of the project was divided into the following segments:

July 1, 1970, through October 31, 1970: Planning, initiation, and startup,

November 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971: Operations limited to Chittenden and Lamoille counties,

July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973: Statewide operations,

July 1, 1973, through October 31, 1973: Evaluation, writing, printing and publishing.

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY — SPECIAL WORK

As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Special Work Enrollments		656		100%
Completed Training		430		65.6%
-Completed, Placed in Employment	307			46.8%
-Completed, Placed in Work Training	26			4.0%
Total Placements			333	50.8%
-Completed, Placed in Education or Skill Training	6			0.9%
-Completed, Awaiting Placement	91			13.9%
Terminated Training		226		34.4%
-Good Cause	99			15.1%
-Without Good Cause	127			19.3%

FINAL TRAINEE SUMMARY — UPGRADING

As of July 2, 1973	Number	Number	Percentage of Total Enrollees
Total Upgrading Enrollments		144	100%
-Completed Training		118	81.9%
Upgraded	114		79.2%
Not Upgraded	4		2.8%
-Terminated Training		26	18.0%
Good Cause	17		11.8%
Without Good Cause	9		6.2%

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	vii
List of Tables	xiii
Section I: Summary	1
Section II: Introduction	9
A. Background and Objectives of E&D Special Work	9
B. Background and Objectives of Public Employment Program	10
C. Economic and Employment Conditions in Vermont During the E&D Project	12
Section III: Mechanics of E&D Special Work Project and the Public Employment Program	15
A. Types of Employers	15
B. Rates of Reimbursement and Wage Ceilings	16
C. Employment Guarantees at Completion of Training	19
D. Service Related Needs and Expenses	20
E. Field Staffing	22
Section IV: Enrollee Characteristics	25
A. Demographic Comparison	25
B. Eligibility Criteria	27
C. Recruitment and Referral Procedures	28
Section V: Types of Jobs Provided by the Two Programs	31
A. General	31
B. Comparative Occupational Breakdowns	34
C. Comparative Wage Analysis	41
Section VI: Role of Supportive Services in Each Program	51
A. General Support Services Available Through PEP	51
B. General Support Services Available Through E&D Special Work	54
C. Day Care	55
D. Training Related Expenses and Enrichment Training	56
E. Counseling, Coaching, Vocational Rehabilitation	58

Page

Section VII: Comparison of Placement Rates 61

A. PEP Placements 61
B. E&D Placements 64

Appendixes

Appendix A: Job Slots Contracted Under PEP By Dictionary Of Occupational Titles And Codes 71
Appendix B: Job Slots Subcontracted Under E&D By Dictionary Of Occupational Titles and Codes 73
Appendix C: PEP Subcontracts By Standard Industrial Classifications 75
Appendix D: E&D Subcontracts By Standard Industrial Classifications 76

Bibliography 77

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Five Year Unemployment Rates, Vt., 1968-1972	12
2.	Five Year Welfare Figures, Vt., 1968-1972	13
3.	Demographic Characteristics of Program Client Bases	26
4.	Poverty Income Criteria (Non-Farm)	28
5.	General Wage Comparison	32
6.	Program Comparison: Jobs With Ten Or More Slots ..	33
7.	Breakdown By Occupational Categories	35
8.	Three Digit Occupational Breakdown	36
9.	Budgeted and Actual Wage Levels	41
10.	Percentages Within Wage Levels	42
11.	Average Hourly Wage Comparisons By Occupational Categories	42
12.	Three Digit DOT Wage Analysis	43
13.	Average Annual Wage Comparisons By Occupational Categories	48
14.	Median Wage Comparisons	49
15.	Examples of TRE Expenditures	57
16.	Breakdown of PEP Placements	61
17.	Placement Patterns in PEP	62
18.	E&D Placement Patterns	64
19.	Most Frequent E&D Placement DOT'S	65
20.	DOT'S of Initial Placement Jobs For All E&D Program Completers	66

SECTION I

SUMMARY

There appear to be some rather significant differences between the Vermont Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) -- Special Work Project (SWP) and the Public Employment Program (PEP).

The purpose of E&D was to work with members of low-income families with dependent children and barriers to employment. Through subsidized Special Work experience and the availability and use of extensive social and employment services, it was hoped that the transition from unemployment to permanent employment would be successfully accomplished. The purpose of PEP was to provide employment for various unemployed segments of the population, Vietnam era veterans especially, and to meet specific public manpower needs in periods of severe unemployment.

The E&D Project could subsidize employment in the public sector or with private nonprofit organizations. PEP could subsidize only public sector jobs. Whereas both programs could subsidize up to 90% of the cost of employment, they each had considerably different budgetary constraints placed on them. If E&D was to obtain the number of slots called for, it would not expend on the average more than $4,000 per slot per year. Also, the employer's share in E&D was a cash contribution to wages and fringe benefits alone.

PEP, on the other hand, could subsidize up to $12,000 per year. The average slot cost it hoped to attain was $7,000 per year. Not only could PEP buy better jobs, but contributions from participating employers did not have to be cash contributions. Employers could make in-kind contributions, a factor that would have greatly facilitated participation in E&D and relieved non-profit employers of some of their very tight budgetary constraints.

Provided below in summary form are comparative analyses which are more fully developed in the body of this paper.

COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM CLIENT BASES

	E&D SWP	PEP
Total Enrollees	643	464
- Males	251 (39%)	391 (84.3%)
- Females	392 (61%)	73 (15.7%)
Age: -18 & under	24 (3.7%)	9 (1.9%)
-19-21	85 (13.2%)	60 (12.9%)
-22-44	474 (73.7%)	316 (68.1%)
-45-54	50 (7.7%)	51 (11%)
-55-64	9 (1.3%)	26 (5.6%)
-65 & over	1 (.2%)	2 (.4%)
Veterans	115 (17.9%)	250 (53.9%)
Non-Veterans	528 (82.1%)	214 (46.1%)
Public Assistance Recipients	428 (66.6%)	53 (11.4%)
Disadvantaged	424 (65.9%)	194 (41.8%)
Handicapped	151 (23.5%)	68 (14.7%)
Rec'd. Former Gov't. Training	170 (26.4%)	1 (.2%)
Education: -0-8	119 (18.5%)	69 (14.9%)
-9-12	443 (68.9%)	277 (59.7%)
-over 12	81 (12.6%)	118 (25.4%)

COMPARATIVE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF PROGRAM CLIENT BASES

Eligibility criteria for the two programs were different because of the objectives of each. Special Work was designed to take ANFC recipients, or unemployed members of low-income families with dependent children and barriers to employment, and place them in transitional subsidized employment. PEP, on the other hand, was designed to alleviate severe unemployment and, at the same time, utilize enrollees in jobs meeting specific public needs. Though it was envisioned that 50% of the PEP jobs would become permanent, nonsubsidized jobs, the prime reason for the program was to provide jobs for the unemployed when unemployment rates exceeded 4.5%.

COMPARATIVE WAGE ANALYSIS

Average Hourly	E&D SWP	PEP
A. Hourly Rate	$ 2.19	$ 2.98
Average Annual Rate	$4,555.00	$ 6,219.00
B. Lowest Hourly Rate	$ 1.60	$ 1.67
Lowest Annual Rate	$3,328.00	$ 3,480.00
C. Highest Hourly Rate	$ 4.00	$ 5.20
Highest Annual Rate	$8,320.00	$10,800.00
D. Average Annualized Reimbursable Cost Per Job Slot.	$3,884.00	$ 7,214.00*

* Discrepancies between figures A. and D. are due to the fact that no E&D contract was written for one full year. Moreover, E&D had varying levels of reimbursement as well as varying time frames and this latter figure represents total monies committed divided by total slots written for.

That PEP could "buy" better jobs than E&D is most evident in the average annual slot allowance each program had. PEP budgeted an average annual slot cost of $7,000 a year, whereas E&D budgeted an average annual slot cost of $4,000. In other words E&D could spend only $4,000 per slot if it was to obtain the number of slots it was expected to. In terms of an hourly wage, the PEP budgeted average was $3.36 per hour; E&D $2.13 per hour.

	PEP	% Difference	E&D
Budgeted Hourly Average	$ 3.36	57.7%	$ 2.13*
Actual Hourly Average	$ 2.99	36.5%	$ 2.19
Budgeted Annual Average	$7,000.00	75.0%	$4,000.00
Actual Annual Average	$6,219.00	36.7%	$4,550.00

* E&D share not to exceed 90% of this figure, or roughly $4,000 annualized.

The average E&D job slot paid slightly more than the budgeted average. The average PEP slot paid considerably less than the budgeted average.

Whereas 53.5% of all PEP slots paid more than the average hourly wage of $2.99, only 42.2% of all E&D job slots paid more than $2.19 average hourly wage. Few jobs in either program paid less than $2.00 an hour, but the great majority of E&D jobs, 85%, paid between $2.00 and $2.99 per hour. In PEP, the majority of slots,

53.5%, paid $3.00 or more per hour. The PEP average hourly wage of $2.99 was, moreover, 36.5% greater than the E&D average hourly wage of $2.19.

Wage Levels	% of Total Slots E&D (556 slots)	PEP (285 slots)
$1.60-1.99 per hour	10.5%	4.5%
$2.00-2.99 per hour	85.0%	42.0%
$3.00 & over per hour	4.5%	53.5%

PEP jobs indisputably paid more than E&D jobs but the comparison below showing median wages of PEP, E&D, and jobs listed on the Vermont State Employment Service (ES) Job Bank (the ES Job Bank is a listing of all jobs listed by employers with the Vermont State Employment Service) places both programs in perspective with respect to job offerings through the Vermont State Employment Service.

		PEP	E&D	ES Job Bank
00-19	Professional, Technical, and Managerial	$3.36	$2.25	$3.40
20-29	Clerical & Sales	2.35	2.00	2.19
30-39	Service Occupations	3.17	2.00	2.04
40-49	Farming, Fishing, Forestry & Related Occ.	2.36	2.18	2.13
50-59	Processing Occupations	----	----	2.18
60-69	Machine Trade Occ.	2.57	2.00	2.62
70-79	Benchwork Occupations	3.73	2.25	2.14
80-89	Structural Work Occ.	2.60	2.50	3.10
90-99	Miscellaneous Occ.	2.88	2.25	2.33

COMPARATIVE OCCUPATIONAL ANALYSIS

A breakdown of PEP and E&D job slots into the nine occupational categories reveals that the heaviest concentrations, ten percent or more, of PEP jobs are in four categories. E&D slots are heavily concentrated in three categories.

		E&D	PEP
0-1	Professional, Technical, and Managerial	23.4%	26.5%
2	Clerical & Sales	26.6%	11.5%

Cont'd

		E&D	PEP
3	Service Occupations	36.2%	28.6%
4	Farming, Fishing, Forestry & Related Occupations	.8%	3.8%
5	Processing Occupations	0	0
6	Machine Trade Occupations	.9%	.3%
7	Benchwork Occupations	1.2%	.7%
8	Structural Work Occupations	9.5%	21.3%
9	Miscellaneous Occupations	1.4%	7.3%

The largest concentration of PEP jobs was in Service Occupations, followed by Professional, Technical and Managerial; Structural Work Occupations; and Clerical and Sales in descending order. E&D job slots were, likewise, most heavily concentrated in Service Occupations, but were followed in descending order by Clerical and Sales, and Professional, Technical and Managerial Positions.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PLACEMENT RATES

PEP Placements

Of the 225 PEP enrollees who have terminated as of June 30, 1973, 86 or 38.2% have been placed either with the PEP employing agent, another public employer, or in private industry. Of all the placements, though, 81.5% were with other than the PEP employing agent.

A total of 67.4% of all placements of PEP participants were in private industry and the majority of those placed in private industry were in DOT codes differing from those in their PEP job slots. This, together with the fact that the highest concentration of private sector placements were in Services and Structural Work Occupations, suggests that PEP was used largely by the enrollees as a measure of "stopgap" employment.

To date there have been only 16 permanent placements in PEP job slots *per se*, and almost half of them have been in clerical positions. Outside the clerical jobs only one specific job classification has had more than one placement in PEP, DOT code 373.884, Fire Fighters.

On the average, the individual permanently placed in his PEP position has held the position 44.5 weeks. Those placed in other positions had been in their PEP job slots an average of 31.2 weeks, again suggesting that PEP was a means of "stopgap" employment and that individuals tended to move out of PEP and into the economic mainstream.

E&D Placements

Whereas E&D had some rather severe financial disincentives that should have hindered successful placement, it nevertheless had an impressive placement record. As of April 20, 1973,[1] 561 enrollees had either completed or terminated Special Work. Of the 561, 266 or 47.4% had been placed. Sixty-nine percent of the placements were with the E&D employer, whereas 31% of the placements were with other than E&D employers.

A total of 69% of all E&D placements were with the E&D employer, almost exactly the opposite as with the PEP enrollees. Of those placed with their E&D employers 78.8% were placed in jobs that were the same DOT classifications as their training slots. In contrast to PEP, E&D job slots and work experience appear to be more truly transitional in nature and do not appear to have been used as a means of stopgap employment.

On the average, the individual E&D client permanently placed was in his E&D job slot for 28.4 weeks, about three weeks less than the average PEP enrollee, but 18 weeks less than the PEP enrollee who was placed with his PEP employing agent.

E&D clients had multiple barriers to employment. Identification of their barriers and needs and the best manner of resolving them was an integral aspect of an E&D client's enrollment. ES counseling and coaching played especially important supportive roles in this respect and did a great deal towards creating suitable supportive work environments for the clients. E&D job slots were developed for a particular individual or an individual was referred to an existing job slot deemed suitable for him and after rather extensive counseling and coaching, not on a competitive basis with other E&D clients, as was the case with PEP enrollees.

The supportive services of E&D and the work environments created by E&D are at least partially accountable for the high placement rates, particularly with the E&D employers. Unlike PEP clients, E&D clients did not respond to economic upturns. They tended to remain with E&D employers. PEP enrollees tended to leave their employing agents for jobs in the private sector suggesting that PEP was used more for stopgap employment. It appears that E&D jobs were more truly transitional as originally envisioned by both programs.

PEP was designed to alleviate unemployment, which it did; and whether it was simply utilized for stopgap employment does not, therefore, really matter so long as a significant portion of the jobs ultimately become permanent public jobs. E&D was designed to assist unemployed members of low-income families with barriers to employment, and through supportive services and subsidized

1 As of June 22, 1973, 610 clients had either completed or terminated Special Work.

employment enable them to obtain permanent nonsubsidized employment. Both programs were effective in serving their goals and their client bases at the time, but were either to become permanent programs each could profit from some of the other's strong points outlined in this paper.

SECTION II

INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Objectives of E&D Special Work

Since July 1970, the Vermont Department of Employment Security has been funded under contract #82-48-70-30 with the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct an Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) Manpower Pilot Project. The overall objective of the project was to explore the feasibility and value of alternative approaches and procedures for conducting a Special Work Project (SWP) for unemployed members of low-income families with dependent children and Upgrading training for the working poor with dependent children. This paper deals only with the Special Work (SW) segment of the project.

As of April 6, 1973 there were 638 enrollees in SW. These clients have been enrolled in subsidized jobs in both private and public nonprofit organizations. As the purpose of E&D was to explore the various means of helping these individuals become self-sufficient, either to get off, or prevent their going onto welfare rolls, numerous services were provided to help clients overcome their assorted barriers to employment. Cooperative agreements were set up with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Social Welfare, and the Office of Child Development to assist in the delivery of health, social and day care services called for by the envisioned Family Assistance Program legislation. In addition, employment counseling and coaching and manpower services were provided by the Department of Employment Security (DES) Employment Service (ES).

The Special Work jobs were more oriented toward providing work experience than for providing skill training, and it was in the former respect that the jobs were hoped to be transitional. During the work experience all necessary services were to be made available to the enrollees, and the ES Counselors and Coaches were to reinforce positive work habits and attitudes. The Special Work "job" was a period during which the enrollee would be worked with so that he would be able to obtain and keep a nonsubsidized job at the end of the subcontract, either with the subcontracting agent or with another employer. As much as possible was to be done with the subcontracting employers, short of a hard and fast guarantee, to assure the hiring of successful enrollees at the end of Special Work subcontracts.

Specifically the Vermont E&D Project has attempted to:

- -test the feasibility and effectiveness of alternative operating procedures;
- -identify problems and issues central to the establishment of these programs;
- -research and document the impact of the programs on E&D manpower clients; and
- -produce monographs and special studies on salient aspects of the project experience relevant to planning activities at the national level for implementation of welfare reform and/or public service employment programs.

In 1971, when the E&D Project was well into its operational phase, the employment picture in both the nation and Vermont took a severe downturn. In July 1971, President Nixon created the Public Employment Program (PEP) by signing the Emergency Employment Act (EEA) (Public Law 92-54) into law. This proved very propitious to the Vermont E&D Project in two respects.

First, because of the unemployment situation, many people were eligible for and applying for Special Work positions who otherwise would not have been eligible under more favorable economic conditions. The project was designed to work, primarily, with welfare recipients with dependent children or unemployed low-income families with dependent children with barriers to employment, not people who were unemployed simply because of an overall economic downturn. PEP was designed to assist this latter group (basically qualified workers who were unemployed due to a lack of jobs) and thereby played a major role in allowing the E&D Project to function as it was intended.

Secondly, the concurrent running of PEP and the E&D Project provided a basis for comparing two totally different public employment programs: their operational procedures, the inherent problems in each, and the impact of each program on two completely different client groups (the first, basically disadvantaged low-income families with dependent children; the second, basically nondisadvantaged).

B. Background and Objectives of Public Employment Program

The recession in 1970 and 1971 affected a broad segment of the population as the national unemployment rate rose from 3.6% in 1968 to 5.9% in 1971. Among the 5,000,000 unemployed in 1971 were 325,000 returning Vietnam veterans. Cutbacks in aerospace and defense expenditures added some 75,000 scientists and engineers to the unemployment rolls. Hardest hit by the recession were the poor, particularly in the poverty areas of larger cities. The unemployment problem was staggering in its

dimensions and, in particular, in the gamut of skill levels and talents represented.[1]

In order to alleviate unemployment and manpower shortages in State and local government, the Emergency Employment Act was signed into law in July 1971. The act created 140,000 State and local governmental jobs ranging in skill levels from the unskilled to the highly skilled professional. Priority was given to Vietnam veterans and in descending order through other significant unemployed segments down to the generally unemployed. Considering the fact that there were 5,000,000 unemployed persons and only 140,000 jobs created by the Emergency Employment Act, and also considering the wide variety of skill levels involved, the impact of the Emergency Employment Act could not help but be diffuse.

Monies were available under two titles of the act, Sections 5 and 6. The first was to provide funds when the national unemployment rate reached or exceeded 4.5%. The second, for more severely hit areas, provided additional funds when the local unemployment rate reached or exceeded six percent, regardless of the national rate, for three consecutive months.

Stress was placed in the Public Employment Program (PEP) on the transitional nature of the subsidized jobs. Not only were the jobs to take people out of unemployment, but the goal of the program was the hiring of at least 50% of the participants or the making of 50% of the active PEP positions permanent nonsubsidized jobs. Because of the emphasis on the transitional nature of the jobs, significant job-related skill training, manpower services, and reevaluation of civil service personnel procedures provisions were written into the act. This was especially important, since many of the jobs, such as in law enforcement, created under PEP required major expenditures for training and some restructuring of personnel requirements.

Because it was intended that a good portion of the jobs become permanent and that those employed in PEP positions -- particularly those laid off from theretofore highly technical, restricted jobs -- be prepared as well for nonsubsidized jobs in other segments of the economy, the skill training provisions of PEP were of major importance. One of the most important goals of PEP was its training or retraining character, whereas in the E&D Special Work, the emphasis was not on skill training but on work experience.

Four hundred sixty-four people have participated in PEP to date in Vermont. Of this number, about half (225) have terminated. Not until the remaining half has terminated, or the economy picks up to such an extent that the program ends, can any valid final assessment be made regarding the achieve-

---

1 Sar Levitan and Robert Taggart, The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Report (Washington, D.C., 1972), 5-8.

ment of goals -- in particular, those relating to permanent public jobs and the efficacy of the training and manpower provisions of the program. Only those who have terminated from the program thus far can be examined in terms of placement in this report. While the E&D Special Work Project is winding down and most of its enrollees have either completed or terminated, thus providing a fairly accurate measure of achievement, PEP is still an ongoing program. Not until the employment situation in Vermont changes drastically and PEP ends can any accurate measure of PEP's achievement be made.

C. Economic and Employment Conditions in Vermont During the E&D Project

The Vermont E&D Manpower Pilot Project's success/failure ratio was undoubtedly affected by the economic recession that began in 1970, the same recession that created the Public Employment Program (PEP).

The statistics below provide some indication of the extent of the downturn in the Vermont economy between 1968 and 1972.

TABLE 1
Five Year Unemployment Rates, Vt. 1968-1972

Calendar Year	Population	Work Force	Unemployment	Unemployment Rate
1968	429,464	180,550	6,450	3.6%
1969	439,000	184,500	5,800	3.1%
1970	444,732	190,350	9,050	4.8%
1971	*449,624	193,050	12,750	6.6%
1972	*454,570	196,950	12,750	6.5%

* Based on annual population increase of 1.1% from the 1970 census, as projected in An Analysis of Social Economic Characteristics of Vermont, prepared by the Vermont State Planning Office.

While the population of the State has increased approximately 5.9% in the five year period beginning in 1968, the work force has increased by 9.1%. This is explained primarily by the large percentage of working age immigrants to Vermont. In the decade from 1960 to 1970, for example, the population grew by 54,851. Twenty-six percent of this increase (14,261) was due directly to immigration, and 33% (4,700) of the immigrants were in the 35-54 age group, going directly into the work force. The rapid growth in Vermont of this age group is counter to national trends. Moreover, the rate of increase of working age immigrants to Vermont in conjunction with an increased female participation in the labor force, 16.6% during the decade 1960-1970, has placed an added strain on the employment picture.

While the work force increased by 9.1% over the five year

period, total unemployment nearly doubled from 6,450 to 12,750. The unemployment rate, which takes both factors into consideration, increased from 3.6% to 6.5%.

An additional indication of the economy in Vermont during the test period can be seen in the statistics below, obtained from the Department of Social Welfare, which reflect the increase in the numbers of ANFC (Aid to Needy Families with Children) recipients and General Assistance payments.

TABLE 2
Five Year Welfare Figures, Vt. 1968-1972

Fiscal Year	ANFC Recipients (Individuals)	ANFC (Families)	General Assistance
1968	8,152	*2,264.4	
1969	10,817	3,004.7	**$ 318,600 (424,800)
1970	11,560	3,211.1	964,100
1971	15,347	4,263.1	1,666,400
1972	18,761	5,211.4	2,043,600

* The number of families receiving ANFC grants is derived by dividing total number of individuals by 3.6.

** There was no General Assistance until 1969 and the $318,600 is only for nine months. The figure of $424,800 is the former figure annualized and is the one used in figuring percentage increase. Information as to the number of individuals receiving General Assistance payments is not available.

The magnitude of increases in ANFC recipients is undoubtedly linked to the recession and represents an increase of 130.1% over the five year period. General Assistance payments increased even more dramatically over the past four years, by some 381.1%.

The E&D Project did not become operational until November 1970 and did not begin to operate at capacity until 1971, the period marking the greatest change in the employment and economic pictures in Vermont and the beginning of PEP.

SECTION III

MECHANICS OF E&D SPECIAL WORK PROJECT AND THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

A. Types of Employers

The Public Employment Program was intended not only to provide jobs for the unemployed but also to alleviate growing manpower shortages in State and local governments. Because of this, all positions funded under the Emergency Employment Act were to be public jobs, primarily in State, municipal, or county agencies. While positions funded under E&D Special Work subcontracts were also to fill public needs, E&D was not restricted to just public government agencies. E&D could, in addition, subcontract with any nonprofit corporation for its Special Work positions. At first glance, this makes it look as if E&D Special Work had an added advantage in subcontracting for positions, whereas, in reality, the additional scope was a vital necessity.

During the first fiscal year of E&D, the staff Manpower Specialists marketed Special Work in the most obvious places. Outside of local public schools and institutions of higher learning, the most obvious public agencies were municipal and town agencies. Staff Manpower Specialists ran into considerable resistance from local government agencies, though, particularly in the Burlington area. Of 136 job slots developed in the first fiscal year, only one, less than one percent was in local government. This was with the City of South Burlington, which comprises about one-seventh of the State's largest urban area. Manpower Specialists reported that municipal government officials, more than was the case with other types of nonprofit employers, voiced aversion to employing welfare recipients. As a result of the resistance to Special Work from local government agencies, the E&D Project had to rely heavily on schools and colleges and other nonprofit corporations in the area for slot development. Schools and colleges in the Burlington area, in particular, had a disproportionate share of the Special Work job slots. Those in private nonprofit corporations were numerous but fairly well diffused throughout the available nonprofit organizations.

Only about ten percent of the PEP positions were professional in nature and roughly one-quarter of all positions in PEP were in public works. The vast majority of nonprofessional jobs did not require prior skills, as most positions allowed for skill training. Consequently, many of the jobs funded through PEP would have been ideal for Special Work enrollees. Comparison

of the demographic data in Section III-A leads one to suspect that local resistance to Special Work may well have been due to the fact that PEP was able to provide a much larger subsidy for a longer period of time than E&D. Though both programs could fund equal ratios (i.e., up to 100% of wages), E&D which had a budgeted slot cost average of $4,000 per year could not carry a highly paid job for as long a period of time as PEP with a hoped for slot cost average of $7,000 per year. When wages were such that E&D could have afforded municipal job slots, the basis for town resistance to E&D participation could quite possibly have been due to the fact that the E&D clients had multiple barriers to employment.

B. Rates of Reimbursement and Wage Ceilings

Though the reimbursement rates for the two programs were virtually the same, the mechanism for reimbursement in PEP was much more highly structured.

The employing agency in PEP had to provide at least ten percent of the total cost of the positions provided. But their ten percent could be derived from a combination of sources, either from a direct cash or an in-kind contribution:

1. Depreciation for equipment used by a participant or for overall program administration,

2. A pro rata share of rental based on space occupied by a participant or used for overall program participation,

3. Materials and supplies used by a participant in his duties or for overall program administration,

4. Wages paid to a participant in excess of $12,000 per year,

5. Funds other than EEA funds used to compensate participants for authorized overtime,

6. Advertising,

7. Printing and reproduction,

8. Training and education of participants, supervisors, or PEP administrative staff.

While such in-kind allowable contributions made the writing of subcontracts considerably more complex and represented a potential nightmare for bookkeepers, they nonetheless greatly facilitated participation from employing agencies.

In this discussion it should be understood that the PEP

program was the result of legislation. Practices, procedures, reimbursement rates, maximum and average levels of slot funding, and other specific structural limitations were imposed by legislation. Such was not the case with E&D Special Work where practices, procedures, reimbursement rates, and other specific structural limitations were developed by the Vermont Department of Employment Security, with concurrence and assistance from the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor, in an effort to gain experience through experimentation with structural limitations that could be varied over time as they proved productive or nonproductive. The PEP program was operated in a certain fashion due to legislative mandate; the E&D Special Work program was operated in a certain fashion due to a desire to experiment with certain guidelines and limitations that could be altered when and if they proved unrewarding.

In E&D Special Work the only acceptable contribution was a cash contribution applied to the wage/fringe benefits package. While it was considerably simpler to write E&D Special Work subcontracts, it was also more difficult to participate for the very same reason. Most nonprofit corporations have extremely tight budgets, particularly in times of an economic downturn, as was the case, and a cash contribution could, and did at times, present real problems to potential employers, particularly on such short notice. Allowable in-kind contributions would have assisted them greatly.

Under Section 5 of the Emergency Employment Act, at least 90% of the federal contribution had to be applied towards wages and fringe benefits; under Section 6, 96.8%. The balance of the federal share was divided in varying proportions with the employing agencies under training, other services, and administration. One of the dangers in the PEP reimbursement structure was the possible inflation of the in-kind contributions, which, in turn, would make the federal contribution of 90% or 96.8% towards wages and benefits greater, reducing the participants cash contributions to the barest minimum. The average overall federal share under both sections of PEP amounted to 87% with a 13% contribution from the employing agencies. The portion of the federal share that went to wages and fringe benefits was 95.5%.

The greatest advantage PEP had over E&D Special Work was in the actual amount of money it could expend for a position. PEP called for the creation of positions that paid as much as $12,000 per year. Positions could have higher pay, but anything beyond the $12,000 ceiling had to be provided by the employing agency. While there was a ceiling of $12,000 per position, it was planned that the average PEP position would be in the neighborhood of $7,000 per year. PEP positions, too, were funded for a whole year.

E&D Special Work positions were funded for only six months at a time and were renegotiable for a second six month period.

The biggest limitation on Special Work positions, though, was the average amount of money budgeted per six month period, $2,000, or $4,000 per year; for PEP, the average allowable slot cost was $7,000 per year. This did not mean that Special Work positions could not pay for jobs paying more than $4,000 per year, but that the federal or State share should not, on the average, exceed $4,000 per year or $2,000 per six months.

It was felt that the extra contribution on the part of the employer represented an investment on his part in the enrollee and that this thereby enhanced the latter's chance of being retained by the subcontractor as a permanent employee. E&D staff Manpower Specialists were to negotiate, as much as possible, the percentage of contribution. This contribution could not exceed a federal share of 90% of the cost of a position, cost being wages and fringe benefits only. With each renegotiation of a subcontract, attempts were to be made to reduce the E&D share and increase the employer's investment in the enrollee. In practice, though, this was a relative factor and the federal share often remained at 90%, particularly if the chances of enrollee retention were very favorable. Given employers' budgetary constraints, this was more often than not the case.

Though the $4,000 average per year budgetary limitation seems severe in contrast to PEP's budgeted average of $7,000 per year and ceiling of $12,000 per year, it served the purpose of E&D Special Work well. Most of the jobs created for Special Work were to be, and were in fact, entry level positions, and the pay for these positions did not, as a rule, greatly exceed these amounts. Special Work was not necessarily designed with higher paid, more highly skilled jobs in mind, though it did have considerable experience with such jobs in the Vermont experience.

Undoubtedly, Special Work would profit from PEP's experience by increasing allowable amounts somewhat but retaining the same reimbursement rates. This would give Special Work much greater flexibility. Also, unless subcontractors are given advance notice of programs like Special Work and can budget in their cash contributions, it would greatly facilitate participation if employers were allowed to use in-kind contributions.

Considerations such as these should not be put aside. In PEP, jobs of all skill levels were paid for by the federal government to alleviate unemployment and public manpower needs, the program being designed to work with basically qualified people who were unemployed due to a lack of jobs. Special Work had much the same goals in mind, but, in addition, had the primary goal of dealing with multi-barrier, multi-problem people. Inevitably, this meant problems for the employing agency: problems due to the many and varied service needs of the clients involved; morale problems because of co-worker attitudes towards welfare recipients; Counselor/Coach intrusion with the employers' operations to work with the clients; etc. There were some very attractive features in PEP that the E&D Special Work program

should consider that might make participation more appealing to the prospective employer, particularly for local government agencies and particularly in light of the goals of such programs.

C. Employment Guarantees at Completion of Training

Both programs had the goal of providing transitional jobs leading to permanent, nonsubsidized employment. In the case of PEP, employing agents guarantee to hire the lesser amount of either 50% of the enrollees or the number of vacancies. For example, if the employer has 60 participants and only 30 vacancies, only 15 of the vacancies must be filled with PEP enrollees; conversely, if the employer has 50 vacancies and only 20 enrollees, he has to hire only ten of the enrollees. There was no limit on the length of time PEP employees might remain in a specific PEP job, but employers were expected to fulfill their guarantees for PEP employees as soon as suitable positions could become financed with local funds. Those employees who were not hired by the PEP employer were expected to receive, from both the program agent and the employing agent, maximum assistance in locating permanent positions in the private sector and/or placement in other manpower training programs.

E&D Special Work subcontracts did not require a hard and fast guarantee of employment. Rather, they contained a statement that subcontractors would agree to hire enrollees, contingent upon satisfactory job performance and the availability of a funded position. E&D field staff made every possible effort to obtain employment guarantees to the extent possible. It was the goal of Special Work that all funded slots would become permanent, nonsubsidized positions with the subcontractor, or, failing that, the work experience gained through participation in Special Work would enable the enrollee to obtain nonsubsidized employment in the private sector.

Guarantees for employment were completely dependent on the individual subcontractor and the availability of funds. Moreover, the ability to negotiate levels of reimbursement often acted as a means of extracting an informal, unwritten guarantee of employment from subcontractors. This was especially true in the renegotiation of subcontracts. Informal guarantees of employment, more often than not, were sufficient to insure a permanent position. In the second and third years of the project, efforts were made to obtain more formal guarantees from employers, but had employers been forced to make an absolute guarantee, considerable resistance would have been encountered.

Another consideration to take into account regarding Special Work was the fact that many of the jobs developed constituted a pool of slots through which many different E&D clients were filtered in and out. Because of variable problems and needs of E&D clients, the clients often were not enrolled in one slot for the total time called for in the subcontract and the same job

slot was often filled, consequently, by two or more different E&D clients. Such being the case, it was rather difficult to secure a guarantee of employment from the subcontractor. Given the subcontractor's budget and the satisfactory performance of the client, nonsubsidized employment was not too great an obstacle, but it depended to a large degree on the effectiveness with which client service needs were met.

D. Service Related Needs and Expenses

Though the Public Employment Program (PEP) was not designed to work specifically with the disadvantaged, it did make provisions for training and supportive services for enrollees needing them. PEP grants funded under Section 5 could utilize 6.8% of the federal contribution for training and supportive services. No such provision was made for Section 6 grants, but funds allocated under Section 5 could be used for participants under Section 6.

The small percentage of funds allocated for both training and supportive services made it essential that supportive services be provided only when absolutely necessary to secure employment. Supportive services were used primarily by employing agents as in-kind contributions, and the employing agent's share in training and supportive services often accounted for the larger portion of his required ten percent contribution.

The 6.8% of the federal share that could be applied towards training and services was to be applied primarily towards training. Supportive services allowed for included health care, transportation to and from the job site, child care, and vocational or educational counseling. The only one of these ever utilized in Vermont PEP was the health care provision; this was used to assist in the cost of physical examinations required for specific jobs such as for police and fire fighting. PEP funds could also, within certain guidelines, be used for the purchase of training materials for ownership of PEP participants, tuition and laboratory fees, instructor costs, and release time.

The Vermont E&D, on the other hand, had rather extensive provisions for training and supportive service needs because of the needs of the client base it was designed to serve. The Vermont Department of Employment Security provided employment counseling and coaching and its other manpower services. Through cooperative agreements with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Office of Child Development, provisions were made for the procurement of health determinations and services and child care. Additionally, ANFC recipients retained a reduced, thirty and one-third, income disregard grant while enrolled in E&D. Any enrollee could obtain general assistance and food stamps if eligible.

Key ingredients of the Employment Service E&D unit were the counseling and coaching services it provided, the latter proving

to be one of the most vital services relative to successful E&D participation. The E&D unit also had two financial resources to use to meet service needs, Training Related Expense (TRE) and Enrichment Training monies.[1]

A $500 maximum expenditure was allowed per 12 month slot under TRE. These monies were to be used for any reasonable expenditure necessary to assist a Special Work enrollee in work-training progress and retention or ultimate job placement when the needed service could not be obtained through another funded source. They were to provide enrollees with the basic necessities required to get and keep a job. There was no limitation placed on what could or could not be purchased through TRE. Rather, each expenditure was to be considered on the basis of its own merits. The only restrictions were the $500 ceiling per slot or the availability of the service from another funded source. TRE could be, and was, used for a wide variety of purchases, from girdles to uniforms, from car repairs to car insurance. Major purchases through TRE had to have approval of the E&D Central Office Staff and ES Director, but local office Counselors and Coaches could authorize purchases up to $20 with the local office Manager's approval.

The second financial resource available to the E&D unit was Enrichment Training monies. Enrichment Training was not funded during the first project year, but was included in the two succeeding project years to provide another means of dealing with E&D Special Work trainees' deficiencies in (1) basic education and (2) job related skills. The former placed emphasis on remedial instruction in the "3 R's", to assist trainees to speak, read, and write with sufficient ability to function competently in the performance of their Special Work jobs. The latter stressed the development of specific skills, i.e., increased competence in the tasks required for training jobs in order that Special Work trainees would be fully qualified to retain their positions on completion of training. Enrichment Training was supplemental, academic instruction taken by selected trainees during their own time or during release time from their Special Work slot. This was particularly important in Special Work as the emphasis in the subcontracts was not so much on the acquisition of specific skills but on work experience. Originally $21,000 was allocated for Enrichment Training, but this was reduced to $9,600 during the second year of its implementation as the number of active E&D Special Work enrollees diminished.

---

1 Refer to individual monographs for more thorough analysis: The Role of the Coach in Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience; The Use of Enrichment Monies in Public Service: The Vermont Experience; The Use of Training Related Expense Monies in Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience.

In PEP, any training and supportive services costs had to be written into the contract with the employing agent. In E&D, the only cost factors written into Special Work subcontracts were for wages and fringe benefits. Training and supportive services costs, which were extensive, were peripheral to the subcontract itself and were supplied through the Department of Employment Security, Department of Social Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation, the Office of Child Development, Training Related Expense monies, and Enrichment monies. The employer provided the work experience.

E. Field Staffing

The purposes of the two programs were quite accurately reflected by the field staffing of each. PEP was concerned with the creation of jobs to serve the dual purpose of alleviating unemployment and public manpower shortages. It did not concern itself, as a program, with the provision of extensive training and/or supportive services. Because of this, field staffing requirements were minimal and called for no more than one staff Manpower Specialist in each district office and one in the Central Office. The functions of the Manpower Specialist involved the development of jobs, the writing of grants, and the maintenance of the monthly billings from the employing agency.

On the other hand, E&D Special Work was extensively involved in the provision of supportive services to meet client needs. The E&D staff consisted, therefore, of an employability team: a Counselor, a Manpower Specialist, and a Coach. The functions of the E&D Manpower Specialists paralleled those of the PEP Manpower Specialist, but his approach to job development differed in the concern for developing jobs suitable to individual clients, as opposed to developing jobs that met only specific employer needs.

It was through the E&D Counselors and Coaches that the vast array of supportive services were brought into play. The Counselor's primary concern was in employment counseling, testing, and the assessment of client needs. Counselors would also refer clients to other agencies for assessments and supportive services. The Coach's primary function was to keep enrollees on the job, by intervening in crises and by insuring the delivery of minor supportive services. In time, because of these duties, the Coach proved perhaps the most valuable of the team members and assumed the roles of: client advocate, expert on available resources in and out of the program, and public relations representative with area employers.

During the first year of the E&D Project a team was assigned to each of the two areas involved in the project, Burlington and Morrisville. During the second year, when the project went statewide, each district office was assigned a Counselor and a Manpower Specialist to handle E&D work. These district personnel did outreach E&D work to the local offices in the dis-

tricts. Though additional Coaches were not budgeted into succeeding E&D Project proposals, the need for them at the local level was quite apparent. E&D Special Work Coach positions were, therefore, created in some local offices and filled with Special Work clients, or a WIN program coach was made responsible for E&D clients. Though the team was not together at all times under one roof, it was, nonetheless, a team, and had a Coach in each office as a contact for the enrollees.

Staffing not only reflected the purposes of the two programs, but the two types of people enrolled in the programs. PEP enrollees were not necessarily disadvantaged and did not need extensive supportive service, whereas Special Work clients were by and large disadvantaged multi-problem people and did need the services. The staffing of each program was, consequently, appropriate to its objectives and purposes.

SECTION IV

ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS

A. Demographic Comparison

Nowhere are the differing purposes of the two programs more evident than in a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the enrollees. Whereas only 11.4% of the PEP enrollees were public assistance recipients, 66.6% of the Special Work clients were. Over a quarter of the Special Work clients had received previous employment training through the government, but only one PEP enrollee had received any such training. It should be noted, though, that many E&D clients were either former WIN clients or WIN clients in a suspense status while enrolled in E&D. There was, likewise, an approximate three to two differential between the two programs in the numbers of disadvantaged and handicapped enrollees, 65.9% to 41.8% and 23.5% to 14.7% respectively.

The male/female breakdown was considerably different in each of the programs: 84.3% of the PEP enrollees were males as opposed to only 39% males in Special Work. The preponderance of females, 61% in Special Work, was due largely to the large percentage of women in the ANFC caseload.

Educational background was remarkably similar between the two client groups. As expected, though, there was a larger percentage of enrollees with more than a high school education among PEP enrollees.

Not only were the PEP enrollees more educated, as a rule, but they were older than the Special Work enrollees, the greater difference being most evident in the ages over 45.

Outside of the large difference in number of assistance recipients, the only other startling difference between the groups was in the percentage of veterans in each. Only 17.9% of the Special Work enrollees were veterans, but 53.9% of the PEP enrollees were, of which approximately 68% were Vietnam veterans. This was quite an appropriate percentage, as the PEP program was designed largely to alleviate unemployment among returning Vietnam era veterans, just as the Special Work Project was designed to employ unemployed members of low-income families with dependent children.

The two groups were amazingly similar in demographics except in the two areas each was designed to specifically deal with.

TABLE 3

Demographic Characteristics of Program Client Bases

	E&D SWP	PEP
Total Enrollees	643	464
-Males	251 (39%)	391 (84.3%)
-Females	392 (61%)	73 (15.7%)
Age: -18 & under	24 (3.7%)	9 (1.9%)
-19-21	85 (13.2%)	60 (12.9%)
-22-44	475 (73.8%)	316 (68.1%)
-45-54	50 (7.8%)	51 (11%)
-55-64	9 (1.4%)	26 (5.6%)
-65 & over	1 (.1%)	2 (.4%)
Veterans	115 (17.9%)	250 (53.9%)
Non-Veterans	528 (82.1%)	214 (46%)
Public Assistance Recipients	428 (66.6%)	53 (11.4%)
Disadvantaged	424 (65.9%)	194 (41.8%)
Handicapped	151 (23.5%)	68 (14.7%)
Rec'd Former Gov't Training	170 (26.4%)	1 (.2%)
Education:		
-0-8	119 (18.5%)	69 (14.9%)
-9-12	443 (68.9%)	277 (59.7%)
-over 12	81 (12.6%)	118 (25.4%)

B. Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility criteria for the two programs were different because of the objectives of each. Special Work was designed to take ANFC recipients, or unemployed members of low-income families with dependent children and barriers to employment, and place them in transitional subsidized employment. PEP, on the other hand, was designed to alleviate severe unemployment and, at the same time, utilize enrollees in jobs meeting specific public needs. Though it was envisioned that 50% of the PEP jobs would become permanent, nonsubsidized jobs, the prime reason for the program was to provide jobs for the unemployed when unemployment rates exceeded 4.5%.

Participants in PEP were drawn primarily from the ranks of the recently unemployed. Any person, with a few exceptions, unemployed for a period of 14 days was eligible to participate. Preference, however, was given to Vietnam era veterans. The makeup of PEP participants was also to reflect the same proportion of significant segments of the community with respect to:

1. Disabled veterans of the Vietnam era and special veterans;
2. Young persons (18-22 years old);
3. Persons 45 years of age or older;
4. Migrant and seasonal farm workers;
5. Persons whose native tongue is not English and whose ability to speak English is limited;
6. Persons with income below the poverty level or welfare recipients; and
7. Persons who have become unemployed or underemployed as a result of technological change, or whose most recent employment was with federal contractors who have cut back in employment because of shifts in federal expenditure, such as in the defense, aerospace or construction industries.

The income criteria used to define poverty levels in PEP were the standard MDTA (Manpower Development Training Act) income criteria. Throughout the E&D Special Work and PEP experience, poverty levels for Special Work have been more generous. Only recently have the MDTA criteria become higher, while at the same time Special Work poverty criteria remained the same.

TABLE 4

Poverty Income Criteria (Non-Farm)

No. in Household	Special Work (1972)	PEP (1972)	PEP (1973)
1	N/A	$ 2,000	$ 2,100
2	$ 3,120	2,600	2,725
3	3,720	3,300	3,450
4	4,320	4,000	4,200
5	4,920	4,700	4,925
6	5,370	5,300	5,550
7	5,820	5,900	6,200
8	6,120	6,500	6,850

Income criteria was a secondary consideration in PEP, the prime concern being unemployment. In Special Work, however, poverty criteria were strictly adhered to and were a primary consideration in determining client eligibility. First and foremost, any prospective E&D Special Work client had to have one or more dependent children. Anyone receiving an ANFC grant was automatically eligible to participate in Special Work. The former group, though, those who had dependent children and were not receiving ANFC grants, had to meet E&D poverty income criteria.

Prior to the incipiency of PEP, there were many people who applied for participation in Special Work who had become eligible simply by the poor state of the economy in 1971. This created some difficulities in client selection and somewhat jeopardized the test nature of the project, as Special Work represented a means of "stopgap" employment for many basically qualified people unemployed because of a lack of jobs. This was not the envisioned purpose of E&D Special Work at all. Those clients who were not ANFC recipients and met the income criteria were supposed to have various barriers to employment that, given work experience and supportive services of Special Work, could hopefully be overcome, making them fully employable. PEP, then, served an extremely useful function for E&D Special Work by diverting clients who were eligible because of the economic downturn, thereby preserving the integrity of the experimental and demonstration nature of the program.

C. Recruitment and Referral Procedures

Recruitment for E&D Special Work clients was conducted via several channels. The most immediate source of enrollees was through the Department of Employment Security's referral of ANFC recipients in the Work Incentive Program (WIN). Employment Service WIN staff would determine which clients were suitable for referral to E&D Special Work and would then place them in a WIN suspense status.

The Department of Social Welfare referred General Assistance recipients to ES where ES staff determined eligibility and made

referrals to E&D Special Work where applicable.

ES staff made file searches to determine eligibility of any applicants on file, determined eligibility of walk-ins, and made referrals to the E&D unit when suitable. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation did likewise. In Morrisville, the E&D unit had to do a considerable amount of outreach to locate suitable clients, because no Employment Service permanent local office had existed in the Morrisville area for some years, although partial services had been provided area residents through weekly outstationing of staff from the Burlington office of the Employment Service.

Once referred to E&D, the Special Work client was not immediately referred to a job but was given an orientation to the program, referred to Vocational Rehabilitation for a health determination, in Burlington and Morrisville areas only, and counseled to detect additional service needs. Not until after these activities had been completed was the client referred to a Special Work job.

When referred to a Special Work slot, the employer had the final say in whether or not the individual would fill a specific Special Work position. Because of prior counseling, though, clients were usually referred only to jobs deemed suitable to them, where the Supervisors, work environment, etc., were well known to the E&D staff. Moreover, Counselors and Coaches often interceded on behalf of clients to overcome resistance to individual clients from the employer, especially when the job in question was considered particularly suited to an individual.

The PEP referral process was more direct but involved more competition between referred persons for available slots. Due to the economy and the publicity regarding the Emergency Employment Act, there was little need to actively recruit PEP enrollees. Any PEP slot had to be listed with the Employment Service for at least 48 hours prior to its being filled. During the 48 hour period, the Employment Service referred applicants, after they had been certified as eligible by the ES staff, in the following order:

1. disabled veterans of the Vietnam era and special veterans;

2. other veterans of the Vietnam era; and

3. upon request, members of other significant segments.

The only complication in the referral of PEP applicants was the certification by ES as to their eligibility, for no one could be referred to a PEP vacancy without it.

Whereas PEP was beneficial in its speed of accessibility to

vacancies in its recruitment and referral procedures, there was accompanying competition among referees for each vacancy. The Special Work client, on the other hand, had the advantage of extensive services, including Counselors' and Coaches' advocacy on his behalf with employers. What the PEP enrollee gained in speed he lost in personal attention. The Special Work enrollee was referred to a job that had been deemed suitable to him as an individual, with foreknowledge of the working environment and worksite supervisors, and there was usually little or no competition for the job slot. Very often, the Special Work client was referred to a position that had been specifically developed for and subcontracted for him as a result of his counseling experiences. In other words, PEP slots were negotiated with an employer and three of four equally qualified persons, often persons with few if any barriers to employment other than a lack of available jobs. They were referred to the employer who then made his selection of the person he felt to be most qualified. With E&D Special Work, on the other hand, both the slot and the specific multibarrier person to fill it were often negotiated with the employer.

These procedural differences between the two programs were, again, due to the clients each program was designed to serve. The Special Work clients needed the individualized attention far more, as a rule, than the PEP enrollee. If a PEP enrollee did need supportive services and was eligible for them, they were available to him and were allowed for in the program. But obtaining such services would have placed him at a distinct disadvantage in competing for a job, considering the number and caliber of those applying for PEP vacancies and the speed with which enrollees were referred to those vacancies. The prime consideration of PEP was to alleviate unemployment, especially among Vietnam veterans, and, only secondarily, to help those people that needed the individual attention and services provided by Special Work.

SECTION V

TYPES OF JOBS PROVIDED BY THE TWO PROGRAMS

A. General

The attached table (TABLE 6) contains those jobs in both programs that contained ten or more slots. Though these jobs do not represent the total numbers of slots written for, they do illustrate the frequency with which certain slots reoccurred and can serve as a basis for some general observation about the jobs in the two programs.

A very large percentage of the jobs, 42% in the E&D list, were low skill jobs, the last three DOT (Dictionary of Occupational Titles) digits of which were very high, while only about 11% of those in PEP were low skilled. This large percentage is corroborated by the average pay of jobs in the program (see TABLE 5). The average E&D job paid $2.19 per hour, whereas the average PEP job paid $2.99 per hour.

While the low pay was not restricted to low skill jobs alone, it was also reflected in the preponderance of clerical and paraprofessional jobs, which, while requiring high skill levels, often pay quite low. These two categories comprised less than 11% of all the PEP job slots. Thirty-one percent of the slots in E&D were paraprofessional (from the partial listing) and fell into two groupings: Family Caseworkers and Case Aids with private nonprofit organizations; and Teacher Aids and Day/Child Care Attendants. Less than one percent of the PEP slots (on the list) fell into the paraprofessional category.

The clerical jobs on the list accounted for 20% of the total number of E&D slots while all of the clerical slots in PEP accounted for only ten percent of the PEP slots.

Only one job category in PEP had a correspondingly high overall percentage as did some of the E&D jobs: Police, with 14.9% of the total PEP slots. In descending order of frequency were: Highway Maintenance Repairmen, 7.7%; Fire Fighters, 4.5%; Road Laborers, 3.8%; Sewage Plant Operators, 3.5% and Claims Takers, 3.5%.

There is little correlation between the most frequently used jobs in each of the programs, suggesting several possibilities: the programs were meeting quite different needs with different client bases; one program was serving primarily the private nonprofit sector needs while the other served only public sector

TABLE 5

General Wage Comparison

		PEP	E&D
A.	Average Hourly Rate	$ 2.99	$ 2.19
	Average Annual Rate	$ 6,219.00	$ 4,555.00
B.	Lowest Hourly Rate	$ 1.67	$ 1.60
	Lowest Annual Rate	$ 3,480.00	$ 3,328.00
C.	Highest Hourly Rate	$ 5.20	$ 4.00
	Highest Annual Rate	$10,800.00	$ 8,320.00
D.	Average Annualized Reimbursable Cost Per Job Slot	$ 7,214.00*	$ 3,884.00

*Discrepancies between figures A & D are due to the fact that no E&D contract was written for one full year. Moreover, E&D had varying levels of reimbursement as well as varying time frames and this latter figure represents total monies committed divided by total slots written for.

TABLE 6

Program Comparison:

Jobs With Ten Or More Slots

DOT	TITLE	PEP	(Percentage of 287 Slots)	E&D	(Percentage of 839 Slots)
079.378	Dental Assistant	---		13	(1.5%)
096.527	Extension Service Aide	---		20	(2.4%)
166.268	Safety And Sanitary Inspector	2	(.7%)	13	(1.5%)
169.268	Claims Taker	10	(3.5%)	---	
195.108	Caseworker	---		43	(5.1%)
195.208	Case Aide	---		46	(5.5%)
201.368	Secretary	1	(.4%)	10	(1.2%)
209.388	Clerk Typist	8	(2.8%)	59	(7%)
219.388	Clerk, General Office	5	(1.7%)	105	(12.5%)
230.878	Messenger	---		10	(1.2%)
311.878	Counterman, Cafeteria	---		29	(3.5%)
355.878	Child Care Attendant	---		13	(1.5%)
359.878	Nursery School Attendant	---		128	(15.2%)
361.887	Laundry Laborer	4	(1.4%)	12	(1.4%)
373.884	Fire Fighter	13	(4.5%)	1	(.1%)
375.268	Policemen	43	(14.9%)	7	(.8%)
381.887	Porter I	---		39	(4.6%)
382.884	Janitor I	6	(2.1%)	26	(3.1%)
850.887	Road Laborer	11	(3.8%)	1	(.1%)
860.887	Laborer, Carpentry	---		12	(1.4%)
869.884	Construction/Highway Laborer	17	(5.9%)	---	
899.381	Maint. Man, Bldg.	5	(1.7%)	15	(1.8%)
899.884	Highway Maint. Repairman	22	(7.7%)	3	(.4%)
899.887	Maintenance Man Helper, Building	---		17	(2%)
955.782	Sewage Plant Operator	10	(3.5%)	---	
		157	(54.6%)	622	(73.8%)

needs; the jobs in one were predominantly high skilled, in the other low skilled. The lack of paraprofessionals in PEP could be founded not just in the priority of needs, but in a certain amount of realism with which the user agencies approached their PEP staffing. PEP user agencies had to guarantee permanent employment for at least half of the enrollees, whereas E&D subcontractors did not have to guarantee employment, though fairly firm guarantees were obtained in the second and third years of the program. Paraprofessional jobs, though they are extremely useful and meet real needs, are often extra jobs outside of extant budgets. The guarantee for hiring would work against use of such categories in favor of more realistic budget needs. Nonprofit organizations that utilized these categories normally and were not required to guarantee employment would more than likely tend to take advantage of a good deal. Another explanation of the preponderance of paraprofessional jobs possibly lies in the demographic makeup of the two programs.

Sixty-one percent of all E&D clients were female, and approximately 58% of all the paraprofessional jobs were held by women. PEP had a very low percentage of women, 15.7%, and paraprofessional jobs, and most of the women were employed in clerical slots.

Another very interesting disparity between the two programs is in the number of Highway Maintenance Repairmen and Road Laborers in each. While such jobs constituted 17.47% of all PEP slots, they constituted only one-half of a percent of all E&D slots. Such jobs, because of their relatively low skill levels and good pay scales, would have been ideal for E&D clients. Such a large PEP percentage indicates a significant public need in this area, and such a small E&D percentage could possibly corroborate the resistance from local government to participation in E&D with its multi-barrier, multi-problem client base, posed in Section II-A.

B. Comparative Occupational Breakdowns

Breakdown of PEP and E&D job slots into the nine occupational categories reveals the heaviest, ten percent or more, concentration of PEP jobs in four categories; E&D slots in three categories. (See TABLE 7) The largest concentration of PEP jobs was in Service Occupations, followed by Professional, Technical and Managerial; Structural Work Occupations; and Clerical and Sales in descending order. E&D job slots were, likewise, most heavily concentrated in Service Occupations, but were followed in descending order by Clerical and Sales, and Professional, Technical and Managerial Positions.

TABLE 7

Breakdown by Occupational Categories

		PEP	E&D
0-1	Professional, Technical, and Managerial	26.5%	23.4%
2	Clerical & Sales	11.5%	26.6%
3	Service Occupations	28.6%	36.2%
4	Farming, Fishing, Forestry & Related Occupations	3.8%	.8%
5	Processing Occupations	0	0
6	Machine Trade Occupations	.3%	.9%
7	Benchwork Occupations	.7%	1.2%
8	Structural Work Occupations	21.3%	9.5%
9	Miscellaneous Occupations	7.3%	1.4%

Though both programs shared Service Occupations as their most frequently used occupational category, the similarity ends once the specific jobs within the categories are examined. Seventy-eight percent of all PEP Service slots were for Firemen and Police, highly skilled jobs with large training components written into them. Sixty-two and three-tenths of the Service slots were for Policemen, alone. The largest single job classification in E&D Service Occupations was in the paraprofessional area of Day/Child Care Attendants with 42.6%. The balance of E&D slots in the Service Occupations grouping were scattered with the next most frequently used classification being for Porters, 12.9%, which, combined with Janitors, comprises 21.5% of the jobs within the group. The significant difference between the two programs' jobs within this category lies in the skill level of the jobs. The PEP jobs were predominantly very highly skilled, whereas the E&D jobs in the Services category represented the largest single concentration of low skill jobs in E&D (refer to APPENDIX A & B for complete listing of DOT codes).

Within the Clerical and Sales categories there is a rough correlation between the most frequently used job categories in terms of percentage of the slots within the grouping, with groups 209 and 219 containing the majority of clerical jobs. E&D had a much greater concentration within group 219, which includes General Office Clerks, whereas PEP had more slots in group 209, Clerk-Typists, and group 203, Typists. In the Clerical and Sales Division, E&D had more than double the concentration of jobs as PEP, with 26.6% as opposed to 11.5%.

TABLE 8

Three Digit Occupational Breakdown

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	PEP #	PEP % Within Division	E&D #	E&D % Within Division
005	Civil Engineering Occupations	5	6.5	2	1
007	Mechanical Engineering Occupations	4	5.3	--	--
019	Occupations in Architecture and Engineering	1	1.3	--	--
020	Occupations in Mathematics	1	1.3	--	--
040	Occupations in Agricultural Sciences	1	1.3	--	--
045	Occupations in Psychology	--	--	9	4.6
078	Occupations in Medical and Dental Technology	2	2.7	--	--
079	Occupations in Medicine and Health, n.e.c.	2	2.7	17	8.7
090	Occupations in College and University Education	4	5.3	--	--
092	Occupations in Primary School and Kindergarten Ed.	2	2.7	--	--
096	Home Economists and Farm Advisors	5	6.5	20	10.3
099	Occupations in Education, n.e.c.	6	7.9	--	--
100	Librarians	1	1.3	--	--
107	Occupations in Museum, Library Archival Sciences, n.e.c.	1	1.3	--	--
149	Occupations in Art, n.e.c.	1	1.3	--	--
161	Budget and Management Analysis Occupations	1	1.3		
162	Purchasing Management Occupations	--	--	1	.5
165	Public Relations Management Occupations	2	2.7	--	--
166	Personnel & Trg. Adm. Occupations	2	2.7	--	--
168	Inspectors and Investigators, Managerial and Pub. Service	5	6.5	7	3.6
169	Occupations in Adm. Specializations, n.e.c.	21	27.6	2	1
185	Wholesale and Retail Trade Managers and Off.	--	--	4	2
187	Serv. Industry Managers and Officials	1	1.3	5	2.6
188	Public Adm. Managers and Officials	4	5.3	--	2.6
189	Misc. Managers and Officials, n.e.c.	--	--	7	3.6
191	Agents and Appraisers, n.e.c.	1	1.3	1	.5

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	PEP #	PEP % Within Division	E&D #	E&D % Within Division
195	Occupations in Social and Welfare Work	1	1.3	101	51.8
199	Misc. Prof., Tech., Managerial Occupations	--	--	6	3.1
201	Secretaries	1	3	11	4.9
202	Stenographers	1	3	1	.4
203	Typists	3	9.1	--	--
205	Personnel Clerks	--	--	4	1.8
206	File Clerks	1	3	--	--
209	Steno., Typ., Filing, etc., n.e.c.	13	39.5	62	27.9
210	Bookkeepers	--	--	6	2.7
213	Auto. Data Processing Equip. Oper.	1	3	1	.4
215	Bookkeeping-Machine Operators	1	3	--	--
219	Computing and Acct.-Recording Occ., n.e.c.	9	27.4	106	47.6
221	Production Clerks	1	3	--	--
223	Stock Clerks and Related Occupations	1	3	5	2.2
230	Messengers, Errand Boys and Office Boys and Girls	--	--	10	4.6
231	Mail Clerks	--	--	7	3.1
235	Telephone Operators	--	--	2	.9
237	Receptionists and Information Clerks	--	--	2	.9
249	Misc. Clerical Occupations, n.e.c.	1	3	5	2.2
289	Salesmen and Salespersons, Commodities, n.e.c.	--	--	1	.4
306	Maids, Domestic	--	--	1	.3
311	Waiters, Waitresses and Related Serv. Occ.	--	--	29	9.5
313	Chefs and Cooks, Lrg. Hotels and Rest.	--	--	13	4.3
315	Misc. Cooks, Except Domestic	--	--	4	1.3
317	Misc. Food and Bev. Prep. Occupations	--	--	8	2.6
318	Kitchen Workers, n.e.c.	--	--	7	2.3
323	Maids and Housemen, Hotels, Rest. and Related Estab.	--	--	2	.7
354	Unlicensed Midwives and Practical Nurses	2	2.4	7	2.3
355	Attendants, Hosp., Morgues and Related Health Serv.	--	--	13	4.3

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

Three Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	PEP #	PEP % Within Division	E&D #	E&D % Within Division
356	Occupations in Animal Care n.e.c.	--	--	2	.7
359	Misc. Personal Service Occ., n.e.c.	--	--	129	42.6
361	Laundering Occupations	4	4.9	12	4.0
372	Guards and Watchmen, Except Crossing Watchmen	3	3.7	3	1.0
373	Firemen, Fire Dept.	13	15.7	1	.3
375	Policemen and Detectives, Public Service	51	62.3	7	2.3
379	Protective Service Occ., n.e.c.	3	3.7	--	--
381	Porters and Cleaners	--	--	39	12.9
382	Janitors	6	7.3	26	8.6
406	Horticultural Specialty Occ.	--	--	1	14.3
407	Gardening and Groundskeeping Occ.	1	9.1	5	71.4
424	Farm Machinery Operators, n.e.c.	2	18.2	--	--
436	Marine Life Cultivation and Related Occ.	--	--	1	14.3
441	Forest Conservation Occ.	8	72.7	--	--
620	Motor Vehicle and Engineering Equipment Repairmen	1	100	5	62.5
638	Misc. Occ. in Machine Install. and Repair	--	--	2	25
669	Wood Machining Occ., n.e.c.	--	--	1	12.5
709	Misc. Occ. in Fab., Assem. and Repair of Metal Prod.	1	50	--	--
729	Occ. in Assem. and Repair of Elec. Equip., n.e.c.	1	50	--	--
731	Occ. in Fab. and Repair of Games and Toys	--	--	2	20
769	Occ. in Fab. and Repair of Wood Prod., n.e.c.	--	--	6	60
785	Tailors and Dressmakers	--	--	2	20
824	Assem., Install. and Repair of Lighting and Wiring Equip.	--	--	1	1.3
827	Assem., Install. and Repair of Household Appliances	--	--	2	2.5
829	Assem., Install. and Repair of Elec. Prod., n.e.c.	1	1.6	2	2.5
840	Construction and Maint. Painters and Related Occ.	--	--	6	7.5
842	Plasterers and Related Occ.	--	--	2	2.5

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

Three Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	PEP #	PEP % Within Division	E&D #	E&D % Within Division
844	Cement and Concrete Finishing and Related Occ.	--	--	6	7.5
850	Excavating, Grading and Related Occ.	11	18.1	1	1.3
851	Drainage and Related Occ.	1	1.6	--	--
859	Excavating, Grading, Paving, n.e.c.	4	6.6	--	--
860	Carpenters and Related Occ.	--	--	19	23.6
862	Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, etc.	--	--	1	1.3
869	Misc. Construction Occ., n.e.c.	17	27.8	4	5
899	Misc. Structural Work Occ. n.e.c.	27	44.3	36	45
902	Dump Truck Drivers	1	4.8	--	--
905	Truck Drivers, Heavy	5	23.8	--	--
906	Truck Drivers, Light	--	--	7	58.4
913	Passenger Transportation Occ., n.e.c.	--	--	1	8.3
954	Occ. in Filtration, Purification and Dist. of H_2O	2	9.5	--	--
955	Occ. in Disposal of Refuse and Sewage	12	57.1	2	16.7
957	Occ. in Transmission of Communications, n.e.c.	1	4.8	--	--
969	Misc. Amusement, Rec., and Motion Pic. Occ., n.e.c.	--	--	1	8.3
977	Bookbinders and Related Occupations	--	--	1	8.3

The overall percentage of the Professional, Technical, and Managerial was very similar between the two programs. But one occupational category, Occupations in Social and Welfare Work, comprised 51.8% of all the E&D jobs within the division. Specific jobs within the Social and Welfare Work grouping were Family Caseworkers and Case Aides, almost all of which were paraprofessional jobs within private nonprofit organizations. The next most heavily concentrated grouping in E&D was in group 096, Home Economists and Farm Advisors, which consisted of Extension Service Aides. The balance of E&D job slots were distributed between 11 different job groupings.

The PEP jobs within the Professional, Technical, and Managerial division were fairly evenly distributed throughout 23 different job groupings. The only exception to this was in the Occupations in Administrative Specializations, n.e.c., group, which comprised 27.6% of the slots within the division, principal jobs being Claims Takers and Administrative Assistants.

The last division of PEP jobs that carried a large portion of the total slots was Structural Work Occupations, and virtually all of the PEP slots within the division were related to highway maintenance and road labor. In E&D, on the other hand, less than ten percent of all the job slots were in Structural Work Occupations and very few of the jobs in the division were in highway or road maintenance. Most of the E&D slots were in the trades, primarily in helper jobs, in the private nonprofit sector, and approximately half of the E&D slots in the division would qualify as low skill jobs. In contrast, only 13% of the PEP jobs in the division would qualify as low skilled. Even though the PEP jobs in the division were not low skilled in terms of the DOT codes (last three digits), they were nonetheless relatively low skilled jobs that would have been suitable for E&D clients.

The remaining four divisions did not contain very heavy concentrations of job slots in either program. PEP had only nominal representation in divisions six and seven, while E&D had a nominal representation in divisions four and six.

The principal difference between PEP and E&D job slots seems to lie in the difference in the skill levels of the jobs each program had. Whereas E&D jobs were, by and large, low skill, they also served a client base that needed such jobs, borne out by the demographic differences in the client bases. Another factor that no doubt contributed to a preponderance of low skill jobs in E&D was the level of reimbursement that E&D could make and the average cost per E&D slot. The higher skilled jobs paid considerably higher wages, and PEP with an average cost allowance per slot of $7,000 was more than sufficiently able to subsidize such jobs. This is especially true when we consider such ideal jobs, for E&D clients, as the highway maintenance men and road laborers that PEP had so many of. These were jobs not demanding very high skills, that paid reasonably well, and had attractive futures and benefits that would have been ideal for many E&D male clients.

The average such job, however, paid $2.89 per hour, annualizing to $6,011.20, well above the E&D average cost allowance of $4,000 per year. E&D could only fund two-thirds of such a job, leaving a large portion for towns to fund; or by telescoping the time frame, could pay for such jobs for a much shorter period of time than PEP, leaving towns with problems of hiring people without sufficient time to budget in their positions.

If any one factor differentiates PEP and E&D it is not the skill levels of the jobs so much as it is the pay levels of the jobs the two programs offered. PEP could "buy" better paying jobs and did, as the following section illustrates.

C. Comparative Wage Analysis

That PEP could "buy" better jobs than E&D is most evident in the average annual slot allowance each program had. PEP budgeted an average annual slot cost of $7,000 a year, whereas E&D budgeted an average annual slot cost of $4,000. In other words E&D could spend only $4,000 per slot if it was to obtain the number of slots it was expected to. In terms of an hourly wage, the PEP budgeted average was $3.36 per hour; E&D $2.13 per hour. TABLE 9 below contrasts the actual and budgeted amounts per slot in each program.

TABLE 9

Budgeted and Actual Wage Levels

	PEP	% Difference	E&D
Budgeted Hourly Average	$ 3.36	57.7%	$ 2.13*
Actual Hourly Average	2.99	36.5%	2.19
Budgeted Annual Average	$7,000.00	75.0%	$4,000.00
Actual Annual Average	$6,219.00	36.5%	$4,550.00

*E&D share not to exceed 90% of this figure, or roughly $4,000 annualized.

The average E&D job slot paid slightly more than the budgeted average. The average PEP slot paid considerably less than the budgeted average.

TABLE 10

Percentages Within Wage Levels

Wage Levels	% of Total Slots PEP(285 slots)	E&D (556 slots)
$1.60-1.99 per hour	4.5%	10.5%
$2.00-2.99 per hour	42.0%	85.0%
$3.00 & over per hour	53.5%	4.5%

Whereas 53.5% of all PEP slots paid more than the average hourly wage of $2.99, only 42.2% of all E&D job slots paid more than the $2.19 average hourly wage. Few jobs in either program paid less than $2.00 an hour, but the great majority of E&D jobs, 85%, paid between $2.00 and $2.99 per hour. In PEP, the majority of slots, 53.5%, paid $3.00 or more per hour. The PEP average hourly wage of $2.99 was, moreover, 36.5% greater than the E&D average hourly wage of $2.19.

By breaking the programs down into one digit occupational categories, as in TABLES 11 & 12 below, specific differences in pay rates can be seen by category.

TABLE 11

Average Hourly Wage Comparisons

By Occupational Categories

		PEP	% Difference	E&D
0-1	Professional, Technical & Managerial	$3.49	30.7%	$2.67
2	Clerical and Sales	2.28	7.0%	2.13
3	Service Occupations	2.89	32.0%	2.19
4	Farming, Fishing, Forestry and Related Occupations	2.99	20.6%	2.48
5	Processing Occupations	---	---	---
6	Machine Trade Occupations	2.57	12.7%	2.28
7	Benchwork Occupations	3.73	81.9%	2.05
8	Structural Work Occupations	2.74	8.7%	2.52
9	Miscellaneous Occupations	2.71	17.8%	2.30

TABLE 12

Three Digit DOT Wage Analysis

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	Average Hourly Wages PEP	E&D	% PEP Greater Than E&D
005	Civil Engineering Occupations	$3.75	$2.70	38.9%
007	Mechanical Engineering Occupations	2.18		
019	Occupations in Architecture and Engineering	2.64		
020	Occupations in Mathematics	3.32		
040	Occupations in Argicultural Sciences	4.30		
045	Occupations in Psychology		2.67	
078	Occupations in Medical and Dental Technology	4.80	2.83	69.6%
079	Occupations in Medicine and Health, n.e.c.	3.32	2.03	63.5%
090	Occupations in College and University Education	3.80		
092	Occupations in Primary School and Kindergarten Ed.	2.80		
096	Home Economists and Farm Advisors	2.74	2.00	37%
099	Occupations in Education, n.e.c.	3.58	2.50	43.2%
100	Librarians	1.67		
107	Occupations in Museum, Library Archival Sciences, n.e.c.	3.22		
149	Occupations in Art, n.e.c.	4.08		
161	Budget and Management Analysis Occupations	4.87		
162	Purchasing Management Occupations		3.50	
165	Public Relations Management Occupations	4.04		
166	Personnel and Trg. Adm. Occ.	4.10	2.64	55.3%
168	Inspectors and Investigators, Managerial and Public Service	3.72	2.79	33.3%
169	Occupations in Adm. Specializations, n.e.c.	4.04	2.75	46.9%
185	Wholesale and Retail Trade Managers and Off.		3.38	
187	Serv. Industry Managers and Officials	3.36	2.70	24.4%
188	Public Adm. Managers and Officials	3.13		
189	Misc. Managers and Officials, n.e.c		2.53	
191	Agents and Appraisers, n.e.c.	3.46	3.00	15.3%

TABLE 12 (cont'd)

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	Average Hourly Wages PEP	E&D	% PEP Greater Than E&D
195	Occupations in Social and Welfare Work	$3.36	$2.29	46.7%
199	Misc. Prof., Tech., Managerial Occupations		2.36	
201	Secretaries	2.50	1.97	26.9%
202	Stenographers	2.51	2.51	0
203	Typists	2.16		
205	Personnel Clerks	2.33		
206	File Clerks	2.00		
209	Steno., Typ., Filing, etc., n.e.c.	2.38	1.87	27.3%
210	Bookkeepers		2.37	
213	Auto. Data Processing Equipment Operators	2.06	1.88	9.6%
215	Bookkeeping-Machine Operators	2.35		
219	Computing and Acct.-Recording Occupations, n.e.c.	2.37	2.03	16.7%
221	Production Clerks	2.26		
223	Stock Clerks and Related Occupations	2.52	2.10	20%
230	Messengers, Errand Boys and Office Boys and Girls	2.00		
231	Mail Clerks		2.19	
235	Telephone Operators		2.06	
237	Receptionists and Information Clerks		2.50	
249	Misc. Clerical Occupations	1.92	2.06	-7.3%
289	Salesmen and Salespersons, Commodities, n.e.c.		1.97	
306	Maids, Domestic		2.25	
311	Waiters, Waitresses and Related Service Occupations		2.00	
313	Chefs and Cooks, Lrg. Hotels and Rest.		1.95	
315	Misc. Cooks, Except Domestic		2.12	
317	Misc. Food and Bev. Prep. Occ.		1.87	
318	Kitchen Workers, n.e.c.		1.94	
323	Maids and Housemen, Hotels, Rest. and Related Estab.		1.90	
354	Unlicensed Midwives and Practical Nurses	3.00	2.00	50%
355	Attendants, Hosp., Morgues and Related Health Services		2.21	
356	Occupations in Animal Care,n.e.c.		2.00	
359	Misc. Personal Service Occ., n.e.c		2.07	

TABLE 12 (cont'd)

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	Average Hourly Wages PEP	E&D	% PEP Greater Than E&D
361	Laundering Occupations	$2.00	$1.93	3.6%
372	Guards and Watchmen, Except Crossing Watchmen	3.54	2.52	40.5%
373	Firemen, Fire Dept.	3.37	3.45	-2.4%
375	Policemen and Detectives, Public Service	3.27	2.71	20.7%
379	Protective Service Occ., n.e.c.	2.76		
381	Porters and Cleaners		2.08	
382	Janitors	2.27	2.17	4.6%
406	Horticultural Specialty Occ.		2.00	
407	Gardening and Groundskeeping Occupations	3.36	2.23	50%
424	Farm Machinery Operators, n.e.c.	3.25		
436	Marine Life Cultivation and Related Occupations		3.20	
441	Forest Conservation Occupations	2.36		
620	Motor Vehicle and Engineering Equipment Repairmen	2.57	2.17	18.4%
638	Misc. Occ. in Machine Install. and Repair		3.02	
669	Wood Machining Occ., n.e.c.		1.65	
709	Misc. Occ. in Fab., Assem. and Repair of Metal Prod.	2.90		
729	Occ. in Assem. and Repair of Elec. Equip., n.e.c.	4.56		
731	Occ. in Fab. and Repair of Games and Toys		2.00	
769	Occ. in Fab. and Repair of Wood Prod., n.e.c.		2.25	
785	Tailors and Dressmakers		1.91	
824	Assem., Install. and Repair of Lighting and Wiring Equip.		3.00	
827	Assem., Install. and Repair of Household Appliances	2.25		
829	Assem., Install. and Repair of Elec. Prod., n.e.c.	2.75	2.91	-5.8%
840	Construction and Maint. Painters and Related Occupations		2.59	
842	Plasterers and Related Occ.		2.75	

TABLE 12 (cont'd)

Three Digit Occupational Grouping DOT	TITLE	Average Hourly Wages PEP	E&D	% PEP Greater Than E&D
844	Cement and Concrete Finishing and Related Occupations	$	$2.75	
850	Excavating, Grading and Related Occupations	2.73	2.00	36.5%
851	Drainage and Related Occ.	2.60		
859	Excavating, Grading, Paving, n.e.c.	3.16		
860	Carpenters and Related Occ.		2.41	
862	Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, etc.		2.25	
869	Misc. Construction Occupations, n.e.c.	2.49	2.50	-.4%
899	Misc. Structural Work Occ., n.e.c.	2.73	2.26	20.8%
902	Dump Truck Drivers	2.30		
905	Truck Driver, Heavy	2.77		
906	Truck Drivers, Light		2.28	
913	Passenger Transportation Occ., n.e.c.		2.50	
954	Occ. in Filtration, Purification and Dist. of H_2O	3.15		
955	Occ. in Disposal of Refuse and Sewage	2.83	2.50	13.2%
957	Occ. in Transmission of Communications, n.e.c.	2.48		
969	Misc. Amusement, Rec., and Motion Pic. Occ., n.e.c.		2.20	
977	Bookbinders and Related Occ.		2.00	

The greatest single difference is in the Services category, which in the case of PEP was comprised primarily of Police and Firemen with average hourly rates of $3.27 and $3.37 respectively (Even though category 7, Benchwork Occupations, has the largest differential of any category, it is representative of very few jobs in either program, .3% in PEP and .9% in E&D, and the difference, though great, is not very meaningful in terms of an overview of the two programs). The largest services segment in E&D, 42.6% was comprised of Child Day Care Attendants, paraprofessional jobs that paid an average of $2.07 per hour. Another 21.5% of E&D service jobs were for Porters and Janitors and paid average wages of $2.08 and $2.17 respectively.

There were a great many more service jobs proportionally in E&D than in PEP and the average E&D service wage of $2.19 per hour did, indeed, match the E&D overall average wage. There was very little correlation between E&D and PEP jobs. In most cases, PEP jobs in the same group paid considerably more than E&D jobs, with these exceptions: very small pay differences existed in groups 361, Laundering Occupations; 373, Firemen; and 382, Janitors. In fact, the average Fireman slot in E&D paid slightly more than the average PEP Fireman slot.

In the Clerical category, the second largest concentration of E&D job slots, the difference between pay in the two programs was minimal. In one instance again, in group 249, Miscellaneous Clerical Occupations, the E&D job slots paid more than those in PEP. In all other groups, though, the PEP jobs paid more, but not so much more as in the Services category.

Pay differentials within the Professional, Technical, and Managerial category were due to the differences in skill levels of the jobs in each program. Though it appears that there were several groups of shared jobs between the programs, the difference lies primarily in the fact that the jobs in PEP were professional; those in E&D, paraprofessional. By and large, the jobs in PEP were far more highly skilled jobs than those in E&D and this, plus the fact that E&D had to buy only those jobs it could afford, explains the higher pay. Moreover, there were a great many more PEP jobs within this category than for E&D, one-third of which pay more than $4.00 an hour average wage. The highest E&D average wage within this category was $3.50 and only three of the 13 job groupings within the category paid $3.00 or more.

The only other category containing a significant portion of enrollees in each program was Structural Work Occupations, claiming 21.3% of PEP job slots and 9.5% of E&D job slots. The average hourly wage of $2.74 for PEP exceeded E&D's by only 8.7%. Two job groupings in E&D exceeded the average wage of those in PEP: 829, Assembly, Installation, and Repair of Electrical Products, n.e.c., by .4%. In the two remaining shared occupational

grouping PEP's average wage was considerably higher than E&D's.

Though differences exist in the remaining categories and PEP job pay averages were above those in E&D, the jobs in these categories represent very small portions of all the jobs in each program. The Benchwork Occupations category contained only two jobs in PEP, one of which paid very highly. The resulting average, then, is not very meaningful in comparison to the E&D job slots whose pay range in the category was fairly consistent.

TABLE 13 below shows what the average hourly wages in each program are when annualized, in a year containing 2,080 work hours. This illustrates better, perhaps, the limitation that a $4,000 average slot placed on E&D jobs and points up the added flexibility gained by PEP's average job cost of $7,000.

TABLE 13

Average Annual Wage Comparisons
By Occupational Categories

		PEP	% Difference	E&D
0-1	Professional, Technical & Managerial	$7,259.20	30.7%	$5,553.60
2	Clerical and Sales	4,742.40	7.0%	4,430.40
3	Service Occupations	6,011.20	32.0%	4,555.20
4	Farming, Fishing, Forestry and Related Occupations	6,219.20	20.6%	5,158.40
5	Processing Occupations	--------	-----	--------
6	Machine Trade Occupations	5,345.60	12.7%	4,742.40
7	Benchwork Occupations	7,758.40	81.9%	4,264.00
8	Structural Work Occ.	5,699.20	8.7%	5,241.60
9	Miscellaneous Occ.	5,636.80	17.8%	4,784.00

PEP jobs indisputably paid more than E&D jobs, but the following table, showing median wages of PEP, E&D, and the ES Job Bank job slots, (the ES Job Bank is a listing of all jobs listed by employers with the Vermont State Employment Service) places both programs in perspective with respect to job offerings through the Vermont Employment Service.

TABLE 14

Median Wage Comparisons

		P.E.P.	E&D	ES Job Bank[1]
00-19	Professional, Technical, and Managerial	$3.36	$2.25	$3.40
20-29	Clerical & Sales	2.35	2.00	2.19
30-39	Service Occupations	3.17	2.00	2.04
40-49	Farming, Fishing, Forestry & Related Occ.	2.36	2.18	2.13
50-59	Processing Occupations	----	----	2.18
60-69	Machine Trade Occ.	2.57	2.00	2.62
70-79	Benchwork Occupations	3.73	2.25	2.14
80-89	Structural Work Occupations	2.60	2.50	3.10
90-99	Miscellaneous Occ.	2.88	2.25	2.33

PEP median wages were higher than Job Bank medians in five of the eight categories in which comparisons are possible. In only two categories did E&D medians exceed Job Bank medians. With only two exceptions, though, in categories 00-19 and 80-89, E&D job wage medians were fairly well in line with offerings in the Employment Service Job Bank. Differences between PEP and Job Bank offerings, on the other hand, were fairly large.

In category 00-19, E&D job wage medians were considerably lower than those offered in either PEP or the Job Bank, but this is due, again, to the preponderance of paraprofessionals as opposed to professionals. In Clerical & Sales, 20-29, PEP had the highest median; E&D the lowest. The E&D median of $2.00 was just below the allowable average cost of an E&D slot. Again, the difference in category 40-49 is very similar to that in Clerical & Sales with the exception of E&D's median being slightly above that of the Job Bank.

The large difference between the PEP median in Services and E&D and Job Bank medians is due to the fact that the PEP job slots therein were primarily police and fire fighting jobs, jobs that are not customarily recruited for or advertised through ES. The E&D and Job Bank medians are very similar.

[1] Abbas Alnasrawi, Employability Barriers of the Welfare/Manpower Client Group and the Absorptive Capacity of the Private and Public Sectors: The Vermont Experience (Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973), 5 & 38. Job Bank medians were derived from a sample of 3,697 job listings taken from the Vermont Department of Employment Security Job Bank on June 20, July 5, August 24, September 6, and September 27, 1972.

In Machine Trades, 60-69, E&D was well below PEP and the Job Bank. The Job Bank, of course, reflects offerings available in private industry that were not available for E&D and that do pay considerably more than the equivalent jobs in the nonprofit sector. The large difference between PEP and E&D is probably explainable, quite simply, in terms of the extra monies available for PEP job slots.

The great discrepancy between PEP and E&D and the Job Bank in Benchwork Occupations is due again to the presence of only two jobs in the category, one being very high. E&D's $2.25 median was somewhat higher than that of the Job Bank and was much more in line with it.

In Structural Work Occupations, both the PEP and E&D medians were well below the Job Bank median of $3.10 per hour. This difference was definitely due to the higher paying construction jobs in the private sector. E&D and PEP were reasonably similar in this category and although they paid less, their lower pay was more than compensated for by the fact that their jobs were much steadier than the higher paying construction jobs in the private sector that, all too often, are very seasonal in nature.

In the final category, PEP was substantially higher than E&D or the Job Bank, the latter two being reasonably close again. With three exceptions, E&D offerings and those of the Job Bank were fairly similar, and where large differences do exist the reasons are quite apparent: paraprofessional jobs and high paying jobs available in the private sector. PEP jobs were in most cases higher than those in either E&D or the Job Bank, suggesting that PEP was subsidizing jobs not normally advertised through the Employment Service.

SECTION VI

ROLE OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN EACH PROGRAM

A. General Support Services Available Through PEP

The Public Employment Program did make provisions for training and supportive services for its enrollees, but, for the most part, employers provided services and training as parts of their in-kind contribution for participation in the program and such costs were made an integral part of the contracts. Because only a very small portion, 6.8%, of the federal contribution could be applied towards training and supportive services the total amount that would be divided up among all available services and training was minimal. On an average slot allowance of $7,000, this would mean only about $476 that could be spent, of federal money, for training and services, and this money was available only for jobs funded under Section 5.

1. Types of Training and Other Manpower Services Under PEP

Training could take the form of basic or remedial education, classroom vocational instruction, or on-the-job training. It was permissible to use Section 5 funds for the training of PEP participants whose wages and benefits were paid from Section 6. Funds provided by the Act might also be used for supervisors who needed training in order to supervise PEP employees. Further, the PEP supervisors' wages need not be paid from federal funds in order to qualify for such training.

2. Other Supportive Services Under PEP May Include, But Are Not Limited To The Following:

a. Health Care services necessary to make a potential participant available for employment. This could include initial physical examinations, preventive and clinical medical treatment, minor dental treatment, nutrition services, voluntary family planning services, inexpensive prostheses such as glasses, dentures, and hearing aids, and diagnostic psychological services where they were necessary to secure appropriate employment.

b. Transportation to and from the job site, or from the job site to authorized training institutions was a Manpower service and could be charged as training and supportive services. Travel which was incidental to

a participant's official duties was an allowable cost and was reportable as an administrative cost.

c. Child care services where needed to enable the participants to enter employment or training.

d. Vocational or educational counseling.[1]

The only federal monies used in PEP in Vermont were for specific training costs and physical examinations for police and fire fighting jobs. And even though other services were available to PEP enrollees through normal ES channels, utilization of the available services would have placed prospective PEP enrollees at a competitive disadvantage when applying for PEP jobs, as there were more than enough qualified applicants for the positions available. Taking time out to go the normal ES route would have delayed an applicant in the referral process, a process in which speed was of the essence given the number of qualified people available for jobs.

3. Differences In Funding of Services Under PEP and E&D Special Work

Whereas the services component in PEP would have to be considered as part of the $7,000 average annual slot cost, the costs of services provided under E&D Special Work, which were extensive, were not considered part of the E&D Special Work average annual slot cost of $4,000. When the costs of such services are added to the E&D Special Work slot cost, the total cost of such a slot becomes similar to the cost of a PEP slot. In other words, although PEP had an average annual slot cost of $7,000 per year and E&D Special Work had an average annual slot cost of only $4,000 per year, the costs of services under E&D Special Work were over and above the $4,000 average annual slot cost and thus tended to make the total cost of an E&D Special Work slot roughly comparable to the total cost of a PEP slot.

While the E&D client had services available to him during training that tended to compensate, at least temporarily, for a low-paying job and equalize him, value-wise, with the PEP enrollee earning more money, he stood to lose all these services at the end of training and be left with nothing more than a low-paying job. Though the E&D client, especially one who is an ANFC recipient, has considerable incentive to be an E&D enrollee and is well off while he is an E&D client, there is a major disincentive for him to accept a permanent job that pays only an average of $2.19 per hour. The cost of the services, then, has to be considered not simply in terms of the service's immediate effect on the recipient but in terms of its long range effects. Although the

1 United States Department of Labor, Public Employment Program Handbook (Washington, 1972), 36.

government must spend a roughly comparable amount of money to fund either a PEP or an E&D Special Work slot because the cost of services under E&D Special Work must be considered in addition to the $4,000 average annual slot cost, the PEP trainee who is placed in regular employment can expect an income of roughly $7,000 per year while an E&D Special Work trainee who is placed in regular employment can expect an income of something slightly more than $4,000 per year. It should be remembered, however, that the additional costs of services to E&D Special Work enrollees, who much more often than PEP enrollees are multibarrier welfare and/or disadvantaged persons, seem to be necessary to get them into work experience training and keep them there until they can be moved into regular employment. In other words, in the Vermont experiment it cost roughly the same to provide a job paying slightly over $4,500 a year to an E&D Special Work enrollee, who is most often a multibarrier, disadvantaged welfare recipient, as it cost the PEP program in Vermont to obtain a $7,000 a year job for the average PEP enrollee who is seldom a multibarrier, disadvantaged welfare recipient. An annual income of $4,500 is often not sufficient to support even a small family. Slightly more than half of all E&D Special Work enrollees in the Vermont project went directly from a subsidized employment status into nonsubsidized jobs that paid, on the average, slightly over $4,500 per year. The obvious question to be raised is "Can these former Special Work enrollees be expected to progress to higher earnings over time or, conversely, do their $4,500 a year jobs represent close to the maximum earning capacity that can be expected from these persons considering their capability levels? If the second possibility proves to be the case, might not income supplements need to be provided over a long period of time?" We have not learned the answer to this question in the Vermont project.

We have shown that for an average cost comparable to the cost required to provide a $7,000 a year job for an unemployed but basically job-ready PEP program enrollee, the E&D Special Work project has been able to move multibarrier, disadvantaged welfare recipients, and people with similar lack of job readiness, into jobs paying an average annual income of $4,500. Would more money for subsidization of E&D Special Work slots tend to buy better paying nonsubsidized jobs for multibarrier E&D enrollees? We cannot say. We tested the possibility of providing regular employment for multibarrier E&D enrollees for an average annual cost of $4,000 plus the cost of necessary services and learned that with this cost level we were successful in providing slightly more than half of all E&D enrollees with nonsubsidized employment that paid an average of $4,500 a year in wages. We did not test the possibility of using an average annual cost of more than $4,000 plus the cost of services to determine if higher paying jobs for our multibarrier clientele could thus be obtained. This question has yet to be answered.

B. General Support Services Available Through E&D Special Work

E&D Special Work Training was designed to work solely with unemployed members of low-income families with dependent children, both those receiving and not receiving AFDC grants. About two-thirds of the client base in the E&D experience were Welfare recipients. Fifty percent of all enrollees were AFDC recipients: an additional 16% received General Assistance or AFDC and General Assistance combined. AFDC recipients during E&D Special Work Training were eligible for a reduced Welfare grant based on the thirty and one-third income disregard in addition to their E&D job slot earnings. Any AFDC recipients enrolled in PEP were not eligible for the income disregard, as PEP jobs were considered full time employment (whereas E&D Special Work slots were considered "training").

What this meant to the average E&D client with a family size of 4.2 making the average E&D wage of $2.19 per hour was an additional $48.86 per month based on a median AFDC grant of $261.14 per month[1] and allowing $20 a month for employment related expenses. This would increase the annual income from $4,555.20 to $5,141.52. or an additional $586.32 per year.

In addition to the reduced grant, the AFDC recipient would also be eligible for Medicaid and food stamps. the average annual values for which can only be estimated at this time. The value from Medicaid that the family would receive would be $840.46 per year and the value of food stamps would be an additional $101.04 per year. This would mean an additional valued $941.50 per year added to the client's already increased income of $5,141.52 increasing it further to $6,083.02 per year.[2]

An annual income of $6,083.02 compares very favorably with the PEP annual average income of $6,219.20. But such an annual income represents an ideal for the E&D/AFDC client. Only one E&D client out of 280 ever waited a full year in an E&D slot before placement. The average E&D client who completed and was placed was in the E&D slot only 28.4 weeks. This would mean the AFDC/E&D client received the higher income, i.e. with Welfare benefits, of $116.98 for only 28.4 weeks and would receive only the $87.60 from the E&D job for the remaining 23.6 weeks. In terms of annual income, the average AFDC/E&D client would in reality receive only $5,389.59 for the year.

On the other hand, the PEP enrollee receiving a higher subsidized wage and being placed in his PEP slot at the end of sixteen weeks and not having had the Welfare Assistance, would continue receiving and realizing the same high wage, and, in the course of a year, would be about $1,200 ahead of the E&D client

1 Milton J. Nadworny, Financial Disincentives For Clients To Enter Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience (Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973), 1-15.

2 Ibid.

who had been earning roughly the same amount while in a training status.

While the AFDC recipient who was also an E&D client received such a reduced welfare grant, Medicaid, and food stamps, the client who was not an AFDC recipient, one-half of the E&D clients, was eligible only for the food stamps. Such a client's income, with the food stamp value added on, would remain the same during and after training, although at a rather low pay level. The true add-on value of the welfare package seems somewhat nebulous. At best it was advantageous for the AFDC recipient while in a training status. The non-AFDC client did not benefit at all from it and the AFDC recipient was not any better off, financially, at placement than before he entered the job slot, except for female-headed families for whom the income disregard would continue beyond training. In contrast, the PEP enrollee, whose subsidized wage was considerably higher initially but did not receive the Welfare Assistance, retains the same high level of income regardless of the point in time at which his job subsidy ends and he becomes a permanent employee.

Though the Welfare Assistance benefits eligible enrollees while in training and tends to equalize AFDC recipient enrollees with PEP enrollees for a period of time, it does not appear to make up for the difference in wage subsidies over the long haul. This appears true for all the cash extras that E&D clients received. Though Training Related Expense and Enrichment could continue for 180 days if needed, they eventually ended. Child care had a phase-out period if the trainee was not immediately placed, but it, too, eventually ends. Female adult AFDC recipients continue the thirty and one-third income disregard during employment. The non-AFDC recipient, or the male AFDC recipient who was a member of a two adult family, was effectively deprived of considerable income at completion of training. The services that were, perhaps, the most valuable in the long run were those without a cash value.

C. Day Care

Another cash value that was considerable, that all E&D Special Work clients were eligible for regardless of whether they were AFDC recipients or not, was Day Care cost reimbursement to Vendors. But this, like the Welfare Assistance, ended when the enrollee accepted permanent employment.

Through a cooperative agreement with the Office of Child Development, E&D clients with dependent children requiring Day Care could have the cost of Day Care reimbursed to the Day Care Vendor by the Office of Child Development. The per child reimbursement rates were as follows:

$28 per week in a licensed Day Care Center;

$24 per week in a licensed home;

$16 per week in an approved home; and

$15 per week in the client's own home.

If the average E&D client, hypothesized in the preceding section, were to have one child requiring Day Care, this could mean an additional $1,456 per year for the client, raising his ideal annual income to $7,539.02, well above the average of the PEP client. But applying the Day Care bonus to the 28.4 weeks above the client's annual income would be $6,184.79, about equal to the PEP enrollee's average income. At completion of training the E&D client would have to assume the cost of child care on a considerably smaller wage than the PEP enrollee whereas the PEP enrollee, who would receive the same wage when placed permanently would not have to make a new adjustment to his income to cover child care, having assumed that financial responsibility all along because of the ability to allowed for by the higher wage The following year, however, the E&D client assuming he received as much as a ten percent increase in wages, would be making only $5,010 72, $1,200 less than the PEP enrollee's first year wages.

Whereas loss of the reduced welfare grant would simply reduce the client's income at placement, for those not continuing the income disregard loss of the Day Care funds would work against the client's income and would reduce the realized income of the client even more by presenting one more employment cost factor In effect, the $28 reduction would mean a real reduction of $56 in income for the client per week, as an additional $28 would now be coming out of his own income, already reduced $28 per week

Both the Welfare Assistance and Day Care funds were ongoing maintenance items while the client was in a training status that ended, with the noted exceptions, when the client was placed. There were other E&D services with a cash value that were not ongoing maintenance items, that were to be used on a one shot basis as needs arose. Though their overall cash value was not as great as that of Day Care or Welfare Assistance, the services did increase the potential income significantly.

D. Training Related Expenses and Enrichment Training

A Training Related Expense (TRE) was defined by the Vermont E&D Project as any reasonable expenditure of project funds necessary to assist a Special Work enrollee in work-training progress and retention or ultimate job placement, when such assistance could not be obtained from other funded services. These expenditures were found necessary in order to provide an enrollee with basic necessities required to get him the (training) job and keep him at it.

Five hundred dollars was budgeted per slot per year for Training Related Expenses. Roughly one-third of the E&D

enrollees used Training Related Expenses monies, the average expenditure being $49.23. Some clients required only very minimal expenditures, while others required considerably more. The two following columns are indicative of the amounts of expenditures and the variety of items purchased with the funds.

TABLE 15

Examples of TRE Expenditures

$3.00	(bus tokens)	$90.20	(tires)
$5.00	(GED Test)	$60.99	(clothing)
$9.00	(clothing)	$150.00	(auto repair)
$9.90	(shoes)	$100.00	(medical consultation)
$7.50	(newspaper ad)	$175.00	(dental work)
$5.50	(wiper blades)	$122.94	(auto repairs)
$4.13	(gasoline)	$48.50	(clothing)

Though most of the Training Related Expenses pertained to transportation, a wide variety of items deemed necessary for enrollee's employability and job retention were purchased: auto insurance, books, cosmetics, mechanic's tools, moving expenses, office equipment rental, poll taxes, typing manuals, and Weight Watcher's membership.

An additional financial resource, Enrichment Training funds, was available for the E&D client and was designed to deal specifically with client deficiencies in basic education or specific work related skills. The basic educational component was intended to provide remedial instruction in the "3R's," to assist trainees to speak, read, write and do basic mathematical computations with sufficient ability to function completely in their Special Work jobs.

Because Special Work jobs were not intended to provide skill training, per se, but rather work experience, a need was perceived for a means of providing specific skill training to enable clients to be completely qualified to retain their jobs on completion of training. Enrichment funds were used for this purpose on an individual basis.

No specific amount was alloted per slot for Enrichment funds. Rather, funds were simply included in the E&D budgets for the second and third years, $21,000 and $9,600 respectively, which could be drawn upon as specific needs arose. The largest single expenditure for Enrichment Training was $500 for client participation in an experimental program in further education at Goddard College. The smallest expenditure was ten dollars for a text book for a college psychology course. The average cost of Enrichment Training among the nine percent of all E&D clients who utilized this resource was $91.87.

Enrichment funds paid for client participation in the experimental program mentioned previously as well as seminars in Alcoholism and for Dental Technologists. Enrichment Training funds bought educational therapy and tutoring for clients and a number of high school and college courses in:

Advanced Automobile Technology
Bookkeeping
Child Psychology
Classroom Communications
Clerk-typing
Counseling
Dental Technology (correspondence)
Electrical Wiring
English
Learning Disabilities
Plumbing
Psychology
Small Engine Repair
Sociology
Speech Remediation
Stenography
Theory and Methods of Assisting Dental Surgeons
Typing
Woodworking

Both Enrichment Training and Training Related Expense expenditures were handled through the E&D field staff on an individual as-needed basis. Their value to the E&D clients was as a potential resource, if and when the need arose, and thus cannot be considered as an add-on cash value for the average E&D client.

E. Counseling, Coaching, Vocational Rehabilitation

Employment counseling and the services of Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) were most definitely available to PEP enrollees but utilization of these services by them would have slowed down the referral process to a particular job. Given the number of applicants available for the jobs, taking time out for employment counseling or Vocational Rehabilitation services would have placed a PEP enrollee at a competitive disadvantage. The job would not necessarily wait for him, nor would a specific job be developed for a particular PEP enrollee.

On the other hand, all E&D clients had to proceed through the services of the Employment Service E&D team, and most of the E&D clients were referred to Vocational Rehabilitation for a determination of health needs. The latter was especially true in the Burlington and Morrisville E&D projects where a mandatory referral to VR was universal. Clients were not referred to jobs without prior counseling, nor was there a need to refer them immediately. The only people who could hold E&D jobs were E&D clients and all went through the same E&D team. There was no competition for any particular job slot; moreover, the E&D team could develop specific jobs for individual E&D clients.

All clients were first referred to the E&D Counselor and received normal ES employment counseling. If deemed necessary, clients were administered the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) and/or the Kuder Preference Test to determine just what would be

the most suitable job slot for the individual. Determinations were also made by Counselors as to what an individual's barriers to employment might be and the best means by which these barriers could be circumvented.

Referrals to Vocational Rehabilitation were for a general health determination on the individuals and to provide preventive and clinical medical treatment, dental work, psychological diagnosis, and inexpensive prostheses. Only when an individual was considered ready for employment would he be referred to a specific job interview. Not only would Counselors and Coaches assist individuals in interview procedures, but they would often pave the way for the individual by talking in advance with employers.

The E&D Coach's job was to insure that clients remained on the job once placed in an E&D slot. This could take practically any form from responding to emergency needs, intervening in crisis situations, assuming the role of client advocate with employers, providing Day Care and other needs through Training Related Expenses, and providing encouragement. The Coach's role, was, perhaps, most useful as a link with local community resources that could be called upon when needed or to which clients could be referred for specific services.[1]

Whereas financial resources and values were considerable to an E&D client while in training and tended to equalize an E&D client's income with that of a PEP enrollee, they were not sufficient to sustain the E&D client at the end of training, over the long run. Financially speaking, the PEP enrollee who received the higher wage all along was better off, but PEP enrollees were,more than likely, because of time and competitive factors, not able to avail themselves of the employment counseling and coaching and Vocational Rehabilitation services that were part and parcel of an E&D client's enrollment.

The financial benefits to E&D clients ended, with certain exceptions noted, with completion of training; and the clients were left with comparatively low wages that they were expected to make do on. The low paying job, that E&D was in effect limited to subsidizing by budgetary considerations, in conjunction with the loss of cash benefits at completion of training represented a rather considerable financial disincentive for E&D clients to go to work permanently. Despite these factors, the Vermont E&D Project had a rather remarkable placement record, much of the credit for which must be placed with the very services that meant the least to the clients in terms of cash value.

---

1 Refer to monograph on The Role of the Coach in Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience.

SECTION VII

COMPARISON OF PLACEMENT RATES

A. PEP Placements

Of the 225 PEP enrollees who have terminated as of June 30, 1973, 86, 38.2% have been placed either with the PEP employing agent, another public employer, or in private industry. Of all the placements, though, 81.5% were with other than the PEP employing agent.

TABLE 16

Breakdown of PEP Placements

	# in PEP	% PEP	# in other Pub.	% in other Pub.	# in Priv.	% in Priv.	Total #	% Total
Professional Technical & Managerial	2	2.3%	2	2.3%	3	3.5%	7	8.1%
Clerical & Sales	7	8.1%	0	---	4	4.7%	11	12.8%
Service	3	3.5%	6	7.0%	17	19.8%	26	30.3%
Farming, Fishing and Forestry	0	--	1	1.2%	1	1.1%	2	2.3%
Processing	--	--	--	---	--	--	0	---
Machine Trades	0	--	1	1.2%	1	1.1%	2	2.3%
Benchwork	0	--	0	---	2	2.3%	2	2.3%
Structural Work	2	2.3%	1	1.2%	29	33.7%	32	37.2%
Miscellaneous	2	2.3%	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	4	4.7%
Total	10	18.5%	12	14.0%	58	67.4%	86	100.0%

A total of 67.4% of all PEP placements were in private industry and the majority of those placed in private industry were in DOT codes differing from those in their PEP job slots. This, together with the fact that the highest concentration of private sector placements were in Services and Structural Work occupations, suggests that PEP was used largely by the enrollees as a measure of "stopgap" employment.

This appears to be especially true for the Highway Maintenance men, 899.884, where ten of the 11 placements were in the private sector and in different than the PEP DOT codes. A like situation existed for the police jobs. Of a total of 14 placements, ten were in private sector jobs with different DOT codes.

To date there have been only 16 placements in PEP job slots per se, and almost half of them have been in clerical positions. Outside of the clerical jobs only one specific job classification has had more than one placement in PEP, DOT code 373.884, Fire Fighters.

On the average, the individual permanently placed in his PEP position has held the position 44.5 weeks. Those placed in other positions had been in their PEP job slots an average of 31.2 weeks, again suggesting that PEP was a means of "stopgap" employment and that individuals tended to move out of PEP with pickups in the economy.

Refer to TABLE 17 that follows for a complete listing of PEP placements to date.

TABLE 17

Placement Patterns in PEP

DOT CODE	Placed With				Same DOT		Higher Wage	
	PEP Agent	Other Public Agency	Private Industry	Not Placed	Yes	No	Yes	No
003.281				1				
005.281				1				
045.108		1				1		
092.228				8				
092.588			1			1		
099.368				1				
168.168	1				1		1	
169.168		1	1	5		2	1	1
187.118				1				
188.188			1	1		1		1
195.208				1				
195.228	1					1	1	
199.168				1				
199.388				1				
201.368	2			2	1	1		2

TABLE 17 (cont'd)

DOT CODE	Placed With				Same DOT		Higher Wage	
	PEP Agent	Other Public Agency	Private Industry	Not Placed	Yes	No	Yes	No
202.388				1				
209.588			1	4		1		1
209.388	1		1	3		2	1	1
215.388				1				
215.488	1				1		1	
219.388	3		1	3	3	1	2	2
239.588			1			1	1	
249.368				2				
249.388				1				
341.368				1				
354.828		1				1	1	
373.584			1			1	1	
373.884	3	1	1	3	5	1	4	2
375.268		4	10	11	4	10	8	6
376.868				1				
379.368			2	5		2	2	
381.887			1	4		1	1	
382.884			1	8		1	1	
407.884			1	1				
407.887		1		6		1	1	
454.782			1			1		1
620.281		1	1	1	1	1	2	
710.281			2			2	1	1
827.281			3			3	2	1
831.381			1			1		1
850.883			1	2	1		1	
859.883			6	7	1	5	1	5
860.281			1		1		1	
869.884	1		2	4	1	2	3	
889.884		1	4	7		5	2	3
899.381			1	6		1		1
899.884	1		10	22	2	9	6	6
913.883				1				
954.782			1	4		1	1	
955.885	1			1	1		1	
955.782	1	1		4		2	2	

B. E&D Placements

Whereas E&D had some rather severe financial disincentives that should have hindered successful placement, as discussed in Sections VB and VC, it nevertheless had an impressive placement record. As of April 20, 1973,[1] 561 enrollees had either completed or terminated Special Work. Of the 561, 266. 47.4% had been placed. Sixty-nine percent of the placements were with the E&D employer; whereas 31% of the placements were with other than E&D employers.

TABLE 18

E&D Placement Patterns

	E&D JOBS			NON-E&D JOBS			TOTAL JOBS	
	Number of Jobs	% of SWP Jobs	% of Total Jobs	Number of Jobs	% of NON-SWP Jobs	% of Total Jobs	Number of Jobs	% of Total Jobs
Professional Technical & Managerial	42	22.8%	15.8%	12	14.6%	4.5%	54	20.3%
Clerical & Sales	44	23.9%	16.5%	34	41.5%	12.8%	78	29.3%
Service	75	40.8%	28.2%	6	7.3%	2.3%	81	30.5%
Farming, Fishing & Forestry	3	1.6%	1.1%	1	1.2%	.4%	4	1.5%
Processing	0	0	0	1	1.2%	.4%	1	.4%
Machine Trades	2	1.1%	.7%	6	7.3%	2.3%	8	3.0%
Bench Work	2	1.1%	.7%	4	4.9%	1.5%	6	2.2%
Structural Work	15	8.2%	5.6%	9	11.0%	3.4%	24	9.0%
Miscellaneous	1	.5%	.4%	9	11.0%	3.4%	10	3.8%

1 As of June 22, 1973, 610 clients had either completed or terminated Special Work.

A total of 69% of all E&D placements were with the E&D employer, almost exactly the opposite as with the PEP enrollees. Of those placed with their E&D employers 78.8% were placed in jobs that were the same DOT classifications as their training slots. In contrast to PEP, E&D job slots and work experience appear to be more truly transitional in nature and do not appear to have been used as a means of "stopgap" employment.

TABLE 18 also shows the greatest concentration of placements in E&D to be in Services, Clerical and Sales, and Professional, Technical and Managerial Occupations respectively.

Of the 31% of E&D placements that were with other than the E&D employer, only 25.9% retained the same DOT classification as they had during training. The largest single concentration in this grouping was in Clerical jobs, followed by Professional, Technical and Managerial Occupations. An interesting point to note here, though, is the increase in Structural Work and Miscellaneous Occupations and also a lower percentage of Service jobs.

The fact that most E&D completers who were placed stayed with E&D employers instead of other employers, in contrast to the PEP experience, is most probably explained by the fact that they were, as a group, disadvantaged, as opposed to being simply unemployed. Unlike PEP clients, they were not as ready or as capable to respond to an improvement in the economy. It should also be pointed out that their E&D job slots represented very supportive environments for the clients, environments that, in many respects, had been custom-tailored to the individual's needs by the E&D staff Counselors and Coaches.

TABLE 19 below is comprised of the jobs in which E&D clients were most frequently placed and consists of 51.5% of all placed E&D clients.

TABLE 19

Most Frequent E&D Placement DOT'S

DOT	# Clients	% Clients	Specific Job Areas	% Clients Placed In Specific Job Areas
195.108	15	5.6%	Social Services	8.6%
195.208	8	3.0%		
209.388	23	8.6%	Clerical Work	20.3%
219.388	31	11.7%		
311.878	8	3.0%	Waitressing	3.0%

TABLE 19 (cont'd)

DOT	# Clients	% Clients	Specific Job Areas	% Clients Placed In Specific Job Areas
355.878	11	4.1%	Child Care Services	12.4%
359.878	22			
381.887	7	2.6%	Custodial	7.1%
382.884	12	4.5%		
Total	137	51.5%		51.5%

On the average, the individual E&D client permanently placed was in his E&D job slot for 28.4 weeks, about three weeks less than the average PEP enrollee, but 18 weeks less than the PEP enrollee who was placed with his PEP employing agent.

Refer to TABLE 20 that follows for a complete listing of E&D placements.

TABLE 20

DOT'S OF INITIAL PLACEMENT JOBS

FOR ALL E&D PROGRAM COMPLETERS

	E&D Employer	Non-E&D Employer
005.281	1	--
045.108	1	--
075.378	--	1
079.378	2	--
096.527	4	--
097.228	1	--
099.168	1	--
099.228	--	1
166.228	1	--
169.168	3	--
169.268	1	--
185.168	2	--
186.118	1	1
187.118	1	1
187.168	--	2
189.168	1	1
195.108	15	--
195.168	1	--
195.208	4	4

TABLE 20 (cont'd)

	E&D Employer	Non-E&D Employer
195.228	1	--
195.368	--	1
199.384	2	--
201.368	2	3
202.388	2	--
203.588	--	1
209.388	12	11
210.388	1	2
211.468	1	--
219.388	21	10
222.387	--	1
223.387	1	2
235.862	2	--
249.368	--	1
263.458	--	1
290.478	--	2
299.468	--	2
311.878	8	--
313.381	1	1
315.381	1	--
317.887	1	--
318.887	6	--
355.878	10	1
359.878	21	1
361.887	5	--
372.868	3	--
373.884	1	--
373.268	2	--
381.887	6	1
382.884	10	2
407.884	3	--
411.884	--	1
500.886	--	1
600.280	--	1
617.280	--	1
620.281	1	--
620.884	--	1
637.281	--	1
638.884	1	--
683.782	--	1
689.886	--	1
729.887	--	1
731.884	2	--
782.884	--	1
787.782	--	2
840.781	1	2
844.884	1	--
860.281	2	--
860.381	--	2
860.781	--	1
860.887	2	--
862.884	--	2

TABLE 20 (cont'd)

	E&D Employer	Non-E&D Employer
866.381	1	1
869.281	1	--
899.381	1	1
899.884	1	--
899.887	5	--
904.883	--	1
915.867	--	2
922.887	--	1
920.887	--	1
929.887	--	3
951.885	--	1
952.782	1	--
	184	82

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

JOB SLOTS CONTRACTED UNDER PEP BY DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES AND CODES

DOT	TITLE	SLOTS
005.081	Construction Engineer	2
005.188	Supervisor, Waterworks	2
005.168	Chief Engineer, Waterworks	1
007.384	Draftsman, Mechanical	5
019.288	Estimator & Inspector	1
020.188	Mathematical Technician	1
040.081	Biologist	1
078.381	Medical Laboratory Assistant	2
079.118	Public Health Educator	2
090.228	Faculty Member, College or University	4
092.228	Teacher, Handicapped Persons	2
096.128	Home Economist	5
099.118	Supervisor, Education	1
099.168	Audio-visual Specialist	4
099.228	Athletic Coach	1
100.168	Librarian	1
149.038	Art Teacher	1
161.188	Valuation Engineer	1
165.068	Public Relations Man	2
166.088	Job Analyst	1
166.228	Training Supervisor	1
166.268	Employment Interviewer	2
168.168	Building Inspector	2
168.287	Agricultural Commodity Grader	3
169.118	Labor Relations Specialist	1
169.168	Administrative Assistant	9
169.268	Bondsman	10
169.738	Systems Engineer	1
187.168	Manager, Establishment	1
188.118	Apprentice, Training Representative	2
188.188	Assessor	2
191.287	Furniture Appraiser	1
195.228	Recreation Leader	1
201.368	Secretary	1
202.388	Stenographer	2
203.588	Typist	2
206.588	Brand Recorder	1
209.388	Clerk	8
209.588	Clerk-Typist	3
209.688	Checker	2
213.588	Data Typist	1
215.488	Payroll Clerk	1
219.388	Billing Clerk	5
219.488	Accounting Clerk	4
221.588	Checker-in	1
223.387	Automotive Parts Man	1

APPENDIX A (cont'd)

DOT	TITLE	SLOTS
249.368	Counter Clerk	1
354.878	Nurse Aide	2
361.887	Laundry Laborer	4
372.868	Watchman	3
373.884	Fire Fighter	13
375.118	Police Chief	1
375.588	Parking Enforcement Officer	4
375.260	Patrolman	46
379.368	Radio Dispatcher	3
382.884	Janitor	6
407.887	Laborer, Landscape	1
424.883	Sprayer	2
441.384	Forester Aide	8
620.281	Automobile Mechanic	1
709.281	Locksmith Apprentice	1
729.281	Electrical Repairman	1
831.381	Welder Setup Man	1
850.887	Laborer, Road	11
851.138	Sewer Foreman	1
859.883	Road Roller Operator	4
869.884	Fence Erector	17
899.381	Maintenance Man, Building	5
899.884	Maintenance Man, Helper	22
902.883	Dump Truck Driver	1
905.883	Water Truck Driver	5
954.782	Watershed Tender	2
955.782	Sewage Plant Operator	10
955.885	Sewage Plant Attendant	2
957.782	Control Room Man (Radio & T.V. Broad.)	1

APPENDIX B

JOB SLOTS SUBCONTRACTED UNDER E&D BY DICITIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES AND CODES

DOT	TITLE	SLOTS
005.281	Civil Draftsman	2
045.108	Counselor	9
054.008	Research Worker, Social Welfare	1
079.118	Public Health Educator	1
079.381	Dental Assistant	3
096.527	County Extension Service Nutrition Aide	20
162.168	Buyer, Grain	1
166.268	Employment Interviewer	13
168.168	Building Inspector	3
168.287	Agricultural Commodity Grader	4
169.168	Administrative Assistant	2
185.168	Manager, Store	4
187.118	Director, Community Organization	2
187.168	Manager, Establishment	3
189.168	Manager, Trainee	7
191.118	Booking Agent	1
195.108	Caseworker	43
195.168	Community Organization Worker	8
195.208	Case Aide	46
195.228	Recreation Leader	2
199.384	Scientific Helper	6
201.368	Secretary	11
202.388	Stenographer	1
205.368	Employment Clerk	4
209.388	Typist	59
209.588	Clerk-Typist	3
210.388	Audit Clerk	6
213.582	Key Punch Operator	1
219.388	Clerk, General Office	105
219.588	Posting Clerk	1
223.387	Automotive Parts Man	5
230.878	Messenger	10
231.588	Mail Clerk	7
235.862	Telephone Operator	2
237.368	Receptionist	2
249.368	Counter Clerk	5
289.358	Salesperson	1
306.878	Maid, General	1
311.878	Bus Boy, Cook, Counterman	29
313.138	Baker	3
313.381	Cook, Second	8
313.781	Baker, Hotel	2
315.381	Cook	4
317.884	Sandwich Man	1
317.887	Cook, Helper	7
318.887	Kitchen Helper	7
323.887	Houseman	2
354.878	Nurse Aide	7

APPENDIX B (cont'd)

DOT	TITLE	SLOTS
355.878	Hospital Guide	13
356.874	Animal Caretaker	2
359.873	Chauffeur	1
359.878	Teacher Aide	128
361.887	Laundry Laborer	12
372.868	Watchman	3
373.884	Fire Fighter	1
375.268	Patrolman	7
381.887	Charwoman	3
382.884	Janitor	26
406.884	Laborer, Nursery	1
407.884	Grounds Keeper	4
407.887	Laborer, Landscape	1
436.884	Hatchery Man	1
620.281	Automobile Mechanic	5
638.884	Maintenance Mechanic Helper	2
669.782	Basket Assembler	1
731.884	Toy Assembler, Wood	2
769.884	Repairman, Assembled Wood Products	6
785.381	Seamstress	2
824.281	Electrician	1
827.281	Electrical Appliance Serviceman	2
829.887	Electrician Helper	2
840.781	Painter	4
840.887	Painter Helper	2
842.884	Dry Wall Applicator	1
842.887	Plasterer Helper	1
844.884	Cement Mason	5
844.887	Cement Mason Helper	1
850.887	Laborer, Road	1
860.131	Carpenter Foreman	2
860.281	Maintenance Carpenter	3
860.381	Carpenter	1
860.887	Carpenter Helper	13
862.884	Gas Serviceman Helper	1
869.281	House Builder	1
869.887	Construction Worker	2
899.381	Maintenance Man, Building	15
899.884	Maintenance Man, Helper	3
899.887	Maintenance Man Helper, Building	19
906.883	Truck Driver, Light	7
913.463	Bus Driver	1
955.885	Sewage Plant Attendant	2
969.387	Custodian, Athletic Equipment	1
977.884	Bookbinder	1

APPENDIX C

PEP SUBCONTRACTS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATIONS

COMBINED TOTALS

Professionals	30	10.5%
Nonprofessionals	257	89.5%

NONPROFESSIONAL & PROFESSIONAL

	CATEGORY	#	Percentage
01	Law Enforcement	51	17.8%
02	Education	33	11.5%
03	Public Works & Transportation	72	25.1%
04	Health & Hospitals	15	5.2%
05	Environmental Quality	21	7.3%
06	Fire Protection	15	5.2%
07	Parks & Recreation	13	4.5%
08	Social Services	27	9.4%
09	Other	40	13.9%

PROFESSIONALS ONLY

	CATEGORY	#	Percentage
01	Law Enforcement	1	3.3%
02	Education	3	10.0%
03	Public Works & Transportation	5	16.7%
04	Health & Hospitals	2	6.7%
05	Environmental Quality	---	-----
06	Fire Protection	---	-----
07	Parks & Recreation	4	13.3%
08	Social Services	4	13.3%
09	Other	11	36.7%

APPENDIX D

E&D SUBCONTRACTS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATIONS

SIC Code	Description	Number of Subcontracts	Percentage of Total
1511	General Building Contractors	1	.2%
5933	Secondhand Stores	11	2.7%
8021	Offices of Dentists and Dental Surgeons	3	.7%
8061	Hospitals	2	.5%
8099	Health and Allied Services, NEC	21	5.2%
8111	Legal Services	1	.2%
8211	Elementary and Secondary Schools	88	21.8%
8221	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	43	10.6%
8299	Schools and Educational Services, NEC	11	2.7%
8611	Business Associations	1	.2%
8641	Civic, Social and Fraternal Associations	1	.2%
8671	Charitable Organizations	2	.5%
8699	Nonprofit Membership Organizations, NEC	24	5.9%
8921	Nonprofit Educational and Scientific Research Agencies	1	.2%
9208	Forestry	1	.2%
9272	Personal Services	15	3.8%
9273	Miscellaneous Business Services	16	4.0%
9280	Medical and Other Health Services	88	21.8%
9281	Legal Services, State Government	4	1.1%
9282	Educational Services	2	.5%
9289	Miscellaneous Services	36	8.9%
9290	Regular Government Functions	8	2.0%
9380	Medical and Other Health Services, Local Government	5	1.3%
9389	Miscellaneous Services, Local Government	1	.2%
9390	Regular Government Functions, Local Government	17	4.3%
	TOTAL	403	99.7%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alnasrawi, Abbas and Mabry, John H. Employability Barriers of the Welfare/Manpower Client Group and the Absorptive Capacity of the Private and Public Sectors. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

Burleson, Erica S. The Role of the Coach in Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

Herdman, Robert W. The Use of Enrichment Monies in Public Service Employment Program Administration: The Vermont Experience. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

Herdman, Robert W. The Use of Training Related Expense Monies in Public Service Employment Program Administration: The Vermont Experience. Department of Employment Security, 1973.

Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert. The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment, Part I. Washington, 1972.

Nadworny, Milton J. Financial Disincentives for Clients to Enter Public Service Employment: The Vermont Experience. Vermont Department of Employment Security, 1973.

Public Employment Program Handbook. Washington, 1972.